

# Classical Philology

Vol. V

January, 1910

No. 1

## CERTAIN NUMERALS IN THE GREEK DRAMATIC HYPOTHESES

BY ROY C. FLICKINGER

It is well known that the ancients designated the productions of the great Greek dramatists by numbers. The remains of this system, however, are scanty, being confined to the following items: arg. Soph. *Antigone*:  $\lambda\acute{e}lēktai\ \delta\acute{e}\ t\acute{o}\ \delta\rho\acute{a}ma\ t\acute{o}\u0303t\acute{o}\ t\acute{r}ia\kappa\sigma\tau\acute{o}n\ \delta\acute{e}n\tau\acute{e}p\acute{o}v$ ; arg. Eurip. *Alcestis*:  $t\acute{o}\ \delta\rho\acute{a}ma\ \acute{e}p\acute{o}i\eta\acute{t}\iota\zeta$ ; arg. I. Aristoph. *Aves*:  $\acute{e}\sigma\tau\acute{i}\ \delta\acute{e}\ \lambda\acute{e}$ ;<sup>1</sup> and Grenfell and Hunt, *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* IV, p. 71:

$\Delta\iota\sigma\eta\sigma\bar{\iota}\alpha\lambda\acute{e}\zeta\alpha\eta\delta\bar{\rho}\bar{\sigma}$   
η  
Κρατ[ειν]ον.

Inasmuch as these numerals have become known one at a time, discussion of the subject has been perennial, and ought, one would think, to have yielded a definite conclusion ere now. But such has not been the case. The meaning of these figures and the principle underlying the system are still far from being matters concerning which general agreement has been secured. On the

<sup>1</sup> Omitted in R and E; G reads  $\acute{e}\sigma\tau\acute{i}\ \lambda\acute{e}$ . I have kindly been permitted to examine in proof this portion of Professor White's edition of the *Aves* scholia, where it is pointed out that the current statement (Dindorf, Dübner, Blaydes, Hall and Geldart, Van Leeuwen) that this phrase is not found in V, is incorrect. Blaydes (IV, p. 3) would delete the words; but this is wrong method, since they are the *lectio difficilior*. In other words, it is much easier to understand how a scribe might accidentally, or because he did not understand it, even purposely omit the item than how it crept in, if it did not belong there. Fritzsche (*Quaest. Aristoph.* I, p. 178) believes it a corruption of *eis*  $\delta\acute{e}$  *Δήματα* (!).

contrary, we are in a period of skepticism on the subject. Wilamowitz has rejected all interpretations alike,<sup>1</sup> and it is significant that the authors of the articles on Aristophanes and Euripides in *Pauly-Wissowa* did not deem it worth their while even to mention these numbers.

The discussion of the matter has greatly suffered from being conducted (for the most part) by means of brief notices in the periodicals or of such notes as the editors of the three (extant) plays in question could find room for. And the latter have usually contented themselves with suggesting the most plausible interpretation of the text before them without considering the other instances. Of course, it is conceivable that the numbers were not uniformly derived or that their arrangement was a purely arbitrary one; and in that case its recovery would now be neither possible nor, if possible, particularly valuable. However, the recent addition of the *Dionysalexandros* numeral to those previously known has seemed to me to warrant another attempt to discover whether they are not capable of a uniform explanation.

So far only one solution of the *Dionysalexandros* numeral has been proposed. Körte would refer it to an alphabetical arrangement.<sup>2</sup> Ranke<sup>3</sup> had made this suggestion for the *Aves* numeral long ago, and Wex<sup>4</sup> brought it forward again after the publication of the *Alcestis* numeral in 1834. This last instance is the most plausible one for the theory, since among Euripides' extant titles

<sup>1</sup> *Einleitung in die griech. Tragödie (Heracles*, Vol. I, 1st ed.), p. 150, note 55: "Zwei notizen scheinen darauf zu führen, dass die tragödien auch eine laufende nummer führten, in der hypothesis der Alkestis . . . und in der der Antigone . . . aber sie haben sich bisher jeder deutung entzogen." *Analecta Euripidea*, p. 133: "Opinatur sane vulgo, propter ἑποτῆν illud potissimum, numeris illis quota fabula a poeta conscripta sit indicari, et quoniam uteque numerus opinioni repugnat, corrigit eum donec congruat aut abiciunt . . . et Aristophanes (sc. Byzantius) . . . ordinis cuiusdam, cuius rationem ignoramus, numerum etiam in Alcestide indicaverit." *Ibid.*, p. 143: "Obvia conjectura est, hunc ordinem ab eo (sc. Aristophane Byzantio) indicari, sed ad liquidum perduci nequit." Van Leeuwen in his edition of the *Birds* (p. 3, n. 4) accepts this conclusion. Of course, Wilamowitz was not the first to advocate it, cf. Schneider *De veterum in Aristophanem scholiorum fontibus* (1888), p. 53: "Immo confitendum est in posterum quoque tempus idem incognitum mansurum esse, donec plura et certiora testimonia fuerint reperta." Bergk (*Meineke* II, p. 1000) cites Schneider with approval.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Hermes* XXXIX (1904), pp. 484 f.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. *De vita Aristophanis*, p. cccxiv (prefixed to Thiersch's edition, 1830).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Rhein. Museum* II (1843), pp. 147 f.

fifteen begin with alpha and it is by no means impossible that the same letter introduced enough of the lost titles so that, by coming at the very end of the alphas, the *Alcestis* might have been seventeenth. Wex thought to strengthen his case by citing the fact that such an alphabetical catalogue appears on the back of the Villa Albani statue of Euripides.<sup>1</sup> This, however, was a most unfortunate move on his part. The Villa Albani list is not complete, containing only thirty-six plays; nevertheless thirteen of them begin with alpha and the *Alcestis* stands in the first place!

Nor does the *Dionysalexandros* instance lend itself easily to this explanation. Although Cratinus was credited with only twenty-one plays in antiquity, Meineke and Kock admitted fragments from twenty-six plays into their collections under his name. Accepting this whole list, although five of them must be rejected and at least one or two of the five are *a priori* likely to come from the first third and although both Meineke and Kock did in fact challenge the *Bousiris*, we yet find only seven names beginning with alpha, beta, gamma, and delta. In order to get an eighth play Körte has to count the *Διόνυσοι*, although that is probably a mere *Verschreiben* for *Διονυσαλέξανδρος*.<sup>2</sup>

The *Antigone* numeral is still less probable. In our almost complete list of Sophocles' titles only twenty-three (two of which are spurious) have alpha as their initial letter. For the *Antigone* to be thirty-second, practically every lost title would have to begin with alpha and the *Antigone* stand at the very end of the plays listed under that letter. But neither supposition is likely, though, in favor of the second, it must be granted that the ancients did not arrange alphabetical lists with such strictness as do moderns and, in particular, seem commonly to have disregarded all letters except the initial. But the fact that in all three instances so far considered this theory necessitates arbitrarily placing the plays in question at the very end of those beginning with the same initial adds cumulative weight to the objection.

The remaining number (that of the *Aves*) is just as unfavorable. All the titles of Aristophanes' plays are known, so that

<sup>1</sup> Published by Welcker *Die griech. Tragödien*, pp. 444 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Koch *Rhein. Museum* XLVIII (1893), p. 238.

there can be no doubt on that score. But in an alphabetical list still extant<sup>1</sup> the *Birds* is numbered thirty-one<sup>2</sup> or, if the spurious titles be omitted, twenty-eight. And in either case, thirty-five is entirely out of the question.<sup>3</sup> Bergk, therefore, proposed to read λ' or λα' instead of λε'. Both conjectures (especially the latter) are open to objection paleographically, and the former does not satisfy the demands of an alphabetical list. If the other numerals favored the alphabetical interpretation, we might be justified in accepting Bergk's second proposal,<sup>4</sup> but under the circumstances the theory must fall to the ground.<sup>5</sup>

The oldest and most popular explanation is that these numbers are based upon a chronological enumeration,<sup>6</sup> and is likewise open to grave objection. Though in my opinion this point is not one of much consequence, it has seemed to some that this theory allows too few plays for the earlier years of Sophocles and Euripides.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Novati *Hermes* XIV (1879), pp. 461 ff., and Pauly-Wissowa II, 972 f.

<sup>2</sup>Counting the second *Peace*, which was inadvertently omitted from the list. This omission explains Bergk's first conjecture.

<sup>3</sup>Nevertheless, Christ seems to accept it, cf. *Geschichte der griech. Literatur*, p. 306, n. 1 (4th ed.). Ranke *De vita Aristoph.*, p. cccxii ff., succeeds in making the *Birds* 35th by counting the 'Ανδρομέδα, Γλαῦκος, Δαιδαλος, Δηλία, Ἐρεχθεύς, and Μητροφῶν among Aristophanes' titles!

<sup>4</sup>Hilberg *ZoG*. XXX (1879), pp. 904 ff., and Körte *Hermes* XXXIX (1904), p. 485, accepted these readings and defended the alphabetical explanation in every case. Hilberg properly rejected Wilamowitz's suggestion (*Hermes* XIV, pp. 464 f.) that Aristophanes' titles are arranged chronologically within the individual letters. For, in that case, how could the Δαναΐδες precede his first piece, the Δαιταλεῖ?

<sup>5</sup>Cf. Dindorf, Oxford edition of Aristophanes II, pp. 524: "Ut . . . Samuelis Petiti, criticorum infelicissimi, similis habeatur, qui tantum abest ut numeri Avibus tributu admiretur magnitudinem, ut iusto minorem ducat, et primum quidem quadrigesimam fabulam facere cogitet, deinde, ut litterarum quandam similitudinem correctione sua consequatur, duodequadrigesimam esse decernat posito λη' in Beckii *Commentarii* Vol. III, p. 354."

<sup>6</sup>Accepted for the *Antigone* by Wex (1829), pp. 6 f. and 35; Bode *Geschichte d. hellen. Dichtkunst* (1839) III, 1, p. 391, n. 7; Böckh (1843) p. 120, n.; Schneidewin (3d ed., 1856), p. 30; Blaydes (1859), p. 443; Nauck-Schneidewin (7th ed., 1875), p. 29; D'Ooge (1893), p. 13, n. 7; Jebb (1891), § 22; Wecklein (1897), p. 10, n. 2; Bellermann-Wolff (5th ed., 1892), p. 2, n. 6; Böckh *CIG* I, p. 350b; Welcker *Gr. Tragöd.*, p. 84, n. 25; Ritschl *Rh. Museum* I (1842), p. 76; O. K. Müller (Donaldson) *Hist. of Lit. of Anc. Greece* I, p. 448; Mahaffy *Class. Gr. Lit.*, Vol. I, Pt. ii, p. 59; Haigh *Tragic Drama*, p. 183, n. 1; Christ *Geschichte d. gr. Lit.* (4th ed.), p. 240, n. 2; etc. For the *Alcestis* by Bode *loc. cit.*, p. 472 and n. 3; Welcker *loc. cit.*, p. 450; Bergk *Gr. Literaturgeschichte* III, p. 493, n. 89; Müller (Donaldson) *loc. cit.*, p. 449; Klein *Geschichte d. Dramas* I, p. 448; Haigh *loc. cit.*, p. 208; Christ *loc. cit.*, p. 265, n. 2; etc.

<sup>7</sup>So Glum *De Euripidis Alcest.*, p. 8; Mahaffy *loc. cit.*, p. 101; Dindorf's ed. (1834), p. 7, and (1869), p. 13, n. c; Woolsey's (1860), p. 58; and Paley's (1872), Vol. I, p. 249.

Sophocles' first appearance was in 468 B. C.<sup>1</sup> and the *Antigone* was produced (probably) in 441 B. C., so that, if it were thirty-second in chronological order, he must have brought out an average of one and a seventh plays *per annum* during this period. Euripides' first appearance was in 455 B. C. and the *Alcestis* came out in 438 B. C. It follows that in these eighteen years (counting inclusively) his average must have been slightly less than Sophocles'. In these results *per se* there is little to surprise us. In fact, if we remember that Euripides began to write plays when he was eighteen, did not get a chorus until he was thirty, when he was awarded last place, and did not win a victory before 441 B. C., we must concede that he did very well in getting so many plays accepted. It is true that we should expect greater productivity in Sophocles, whose career opened with such *éclat*; but perhaps the fact that he was never lower than second in a contest was largely due to this self-restraint at first.

On the other hand, with thirty-two of Sophocles' one hundred and twenty-three plays coming before 440 B. C., we have ninety-one remaining for the thirty-five years between that date and his death in 406 B. C.—an average *per annum* of two and three-fifths. The result for Euripides is similar. In the thirty-two years after 438 B. C. he must have written seventy-five plays, or two and a third a year, but this is the less remarkable, since many of his later works are characterized by hasty and careless execution. Now Aeschylus produced ninety plays between his first recorded appearance in 499 B. C. and the *Orestea* in 458 B. C. (forty-two years), or two and a seventh plays a year; and this average was doubtless higher toward the end of his career than earlier, for in the twenty-seven years between his first victory in 484 B. C. and his last appearance in 458 B. C. came thirteen victories and probably several defeats (certainly one, in 468 B. C.) Furthermore, Sophocles' activity in old age is well attested, so that the absence of deterioration can more justly excite our surprise than the mere fact of his productivity. Moreover, we must remember that at this period there were two festivals a year, where tragedies were produced, whereas previously there had been but one. And although this fact could

<sup>1</sup>Possibly 471 B. C.; cf. Eusebius.

not increase the poets' powers of production, yet the earlier dearth of opportunity and consequent difficulty of obtaining a chorus doubtless had a part in restricting their output. Therefore, this objection to the chronological interpretation cannot be considered a valid one.

A more vital obstacle is found in the difficulty of explaining how the *Alcestis*, the fourth play in its group, could have been number seventeen, and how the *Antigone*, which probably was not the fourth member of its group could have been number thirty-two. Jebb<sup>1</sup> (in a different connection) suggests that the satyric plays may not have been included in the enumeration. But this proposal does not help explain the number seventeen, and the fact that the *Alcestis*, which at least takes the place of a satyric play, bears a number would seem to invalidate it. Nor can the difficulty be solved by means of plays brought out at the Lenaean, where tragedies were not produced by tetralogies,<sup>2</sup> for unfortunately tragedy seems not to have been introduced at the Lenaean until subsequently.<sup>3</sup> Teuffel<sup>4</sup> explained that the *Alcestis* belonged to Euripides' seventeenth group, ignoring the fact that this would leave only twenty-four plays ( $92 - 17 \times 4 = 24$ ) for his later and more productive period, and also ignoring the fact that if the *Antigone* numeral be interpreted in the same manner, Sophocles must have produced one hundred and twenty-eight plays in twenty-eight years and none thereafter! Still more radical is Bergk's solution—for  $\iota\zeta'$  he proposed to read  $\iota\zeta'$ , and in arg. *Antigone* δεδιδακται δὲ τὸ δράμα τοῦτο τριακοστόν δεύτερος ( $\eta\nu$ ).<sup>5</sup> These

<sup>1</sup>In his edition of the *Antigone*, p. xlix.

<sup>2</sup>Perhaps this is what Müller (Donaldson) had in mind when he suggested that some trilogies may have been unprovided with a satyric drama, *Hist. of Lit. of Anc. Greece*, I, p. 448, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. Capps *A. J. A.* IV (1900), p. 86, who places this event "between 430 and 440." By letter he informs me that "it cannot be placed much before 432." Similarly Reisch *ZG* (1907), pp. 308 f. (between 425 and 432) and O'Connor *History of Actors and Acting*, pp. 46 f. (about 433).

<sup>4</sup>Cf. *Rh. Museum* XXI (1866), p. 471. See likewise Hadley's *Alcestis*, p. 43, Earle's, pp. 4 f., and Hayley's, p. xix.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. *Gr. Literaturgeschichte* III, p. 493, n. 89, and p. 414, n. 161. His reasons (in the latter case) are as follows: it is generally accepted that the *Antigone* was presented in the spring of 441 b. c., but the *Marmor Parium* informs us that Euripides won his first victory in that year; consequently the *Antigone* must have received the second

arbitrary changes, however, have deservedly failed to gain the approval of scholars. Leaving this problem, then, unsolved for a moment, let us proceed to see how well this chronological hypothesis fits the other instances.

For the *Dionysalexandros* Grenfell and Hunt seem to have been inclined to accept a chronological interpretation, but were deterred by the improbability involved in their supposing the comedy to have been produced in 430–429 B. C. This date is due to the sentence *κωμῳδεῖται δ' ἐν τῷ δράματι Περικλῆς μάλα πιθανός δι' ἐμφάσεως ὡς ἐπαγειοχώς τοῖς Ἀθηναῖοις τὸν πόλεμον*, which occurs at the end of the hypothesis whence this numeral is derived. It should be noted that what war Pericles is thought of as having brought upon the Athenians is not specified, doubtless because other parts of the hypothesis, in which the year of production and other germane facts were given, rendered this unnecessary. Grenfell and Hunt<sup>1</sup> assume the Peloponnesian War to be intended and consequently assign the play to the years above indicated. To decide this question, we must consider the facts of Cratinus' life as we know them. He died shortly after 423 B. C. at the age of ninety-seven.<sup>2</sup> He wrote twenty-one plays and won nine victories,<sup>3</sup> six at the City Dionysia and three at the Lenaea.<sup>4</sup> Hieronymus and Eusebius mention him under 453 B. C. and his name occurs in the City Victors' List in a position corresponding

prize. That the words of the argument *εὐδοκιμήσαντα ἐν τῷ διδασκαλικῷ τῆς Ἀντιγόνης* are not inconsistent with this interpretation may be seen from the similar language of Aristophanes concerning his *Banqueters* (cf. *Nubes* 529 and *schol. ad loc.*), which was likewise awarded the second prize. Furthermore, the number (32) cannot be correct, since the *Antigone* would then be the fourth member of its group (i. e., a satyric play), while with the proposed reading it would occupy the second place. This somewhat attractive suggestion is, however, open to the following objections: (a) we need some independent reason for believing the *Antigone* to be number thirty, (b) we must remember that some think the *Antigone* to have been produced in 442 B. C.; cf. Christ *Geschichte d. gr. Lit.*, p. 310, n. 7 (5th ed.) and (c) the criticism of the numeral is needless, cf. p. 13, below. I may safely ignore the numerous conjectures for the *Alcestis* number (*ις'*, *ιε'*, etc.).

<sup>1</sup> Followed by Körte, Wilamowitz, Croiset, Rutherford, Thieme, etc., cf. Thieme's *Quaestionum comicarum ad Periclem pertinentium capita tria* (1908), pp. 27 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lucian *Macrob.* 25, and Capps *Harv. Stud.* XV (1904), pp. 61 f., who places his death "soon after 422/1."

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Suidas s. v. *Κρατῖνος*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *CIA* II, 977 *d* and *i*, and Capps *A. J. P.* XX (1899), pp. 390–96.

to about that date. The arrangement of the list would seem to indicate that he won several other victories soon after, and, finally, he produced plays in 425, 424, and 423, when he closed his career with a victory.<sup>1</sup> Thus, his eighth play might well have come as early as 446 B. C.

That Cratinus had already at this general period directed his satire against Pericles is proved by Meineke II, p. 218, where he is charged with dilatoriness in completing the middle wall and *ibid.*, p. 61, where there is an unmistakable allusion to his escape from ostracism in 442 B. C. These were troublous times for Athens. In 447 the battle of Chaeronea cost her Boeotia, and the revolt of Euboea and Megara quickly followed. Moreover, as soon as the five years' truce expired (446), the Spartans invaded Attica. The responsibility for these disasters was naturally placed at Pericles' door by his opponents. The attempt of the goddesses to bribe their judge in the *Dionysalexandros* might well have called forth an allusion to Pericles' alleged bribery of the Spartan king to withdraw his army, and the fact that the country people were now for the first time couped up within the Long Walls might have been referred to in that part of the play where Helen is concealed in a bird-cage (ll. 29 ff.: *καὶ τὴν μὲν Ἐλήνην εἰς τάλαρον ἀσπ[ερ δρυν] κρύψας*). In my opinion, however, it is possible to establish a still closer and broader connection between the plot and contemporaneous events. Dionysus, of course, represents Pericles himself and Alexander the conservative leader Thucydides, whose prerogatives Pericles (Dionysus) has usurped. The immense resources at his command would have enabled Pericles to establish his own personal authority over his people (*τυραννίδος δικυρίτου*, Hera's offer in the bribery scene) or by wise military expenditures to guarantee the stability of the Athenian empire through success in war (*εύτυχίας κατὰ πολεμόν*, Athena's offer). Recent occurrences might well have seemed to justify Pericles' enemies in believing that he had lost these two chances forever by deciding in favor of Aphrodite. The hypothesis tells us that Aphrodite

<sup>2</sup> Cf. argg. *Acharn.*, *Equit.*, and *Nubes*, and Lucian *Macrob.* 25.

<sup>1</sup> So Körte. Grenfell and Hunt supply *τυρόν*. Thieme *loc. cit.*, p. 16, finds additional support for Körte's reading in Meineke II, p. 42, fr. xii: *χηνοβοσκοί βουκέλοι*.

promised that Dionysus should be "most beautiful and most beloved" (*καλλιστόν τε καὶ ἐπέραστον αὐτὸν ὑπάρχειν*);<sup>1</sup> and as a result he succeeded in wooing Helen away from Sparta. Of course, the myth hampered Cratinus and the symbolism is less exact and clear than if he had been dealing with a theme of his own invention throughout, but there can be little doubt as to the meaning of Aphrodite's offer—it referred to Pericles' plans for the beautification of Athens. This is not the only place where Athens is compared to a woman. In a passage which Sauppe has correctly recognized as derived from a comic poet Plutarch describes the city at this very period as a wanton decking herself out with costly marbles and thousand-talent temples.<sup>2</sup> If this interpretation is correct, we can understand the meaning of one of the extant fragments (Meineke II, p. 42, fr. ix):

*παραστάδας καὶ πρόθυρα βούλαι ποκίλα.*

Dionysus (i. e., Pericles with his ambitious building schemes) evidently expressed surprise at the simplicity and rudeness of Alexander's mountain quarters and was answered with this sarcastic comment. In the dénouement Alexander hands over Dionysus to the Achaeans<sup>3</sup> and keeps Helen for himself; in other words, Cratinus advises the people to accept Pericles' plans for the city's adornment, since it is now too late to turn back, but to disavow their author and intrust their administration to safer hands. If this explanation seems to attribute too bold an utterance to the poet, it must be remembered that Pericles' name was not yet surrounded with such a glamour as at a later period, that at this particular hour the course of events seemed against him, and, in particular, that the aristocratic party was so confident of success that soon afterward (442 B. C.) they dared to challenge him to the test of ostracism. If the outcome disappointed their fond

<sup>1</sup> Can the reading be <*το*> *καλλιστόν . . . αὐτῷ ὑπάρχειν?*

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Plutarch *Pericles* xii and Sauppe *Ausgewählte Schriften*, p. 500, n. 2. There may be an allusion also to Aspasia, whose connection with Pericles began at about this period, cf. Pauly-Wissowa II, 1716 f.

<sup>3</sup> Wilamowitz sees in this a reference to the Spartan demand for his surrender in 432 B. C. We ought not to suppose, however, that this was the first time Pericles' enemies had thought of his descent from the accursed Alcmaeonidae. On the contrary, this step was doubtless merely the *finale* of long years of discussion both at home and abroad.

expectations, it was neither the first nor last instance of such misplaced optimism. Furthermore, such freedom of attack is consistent with the known character of Cratinus' comedy, and the fact that, as soon as Pericles' position was assured (after 442), restrictive legislation was enacted<sup>1</sup> proves earlier excesses. I therefore believe the *Dionysalexandros* to have been brought out in the spring of 445 and think that it may have been Cratinus' eighth play.

Some one may object that this date is too early for such "Mythenparodie" as this play affords. And it is true that this *motif* is more characteristic of the Middle Comedy, and that this is one of the reasons for assigning the *Nemesis* to the close of the century and to the younger Cratinus.<sup>2</sup> But no one would put the *Dionysalexandros* much later than 430—a date twenty or twenty-five years earlier than the new date for the *Nemesis*—and there is no reason to suppose that the *Dionysalexandros* was the first play of this sort. The fact is that owing to the dearth of information before the *Acharnians* negative generalizations are quite unsafe.

The *Aves* numeral has always been a stumbling-block in the way of every interpretation, and it is no exception in this case. It is evident at once that the *Birds* cannot be the thirty-fifth piece Aristophanes brought out.<sup>3</sup> So that the only recourse left adherents of this explanation is to follow the path that Dindorf pointed out long ago: "Ut si quid absurdī edicere videantur, emendanda potius quam eicienda esse pateat." If any solution that would fit the case (even without regard to its suitability in other instances) had ever been propounded, this procedure would be less justifiable; but under the circumstances it is only a question of finding an intelligible and paleographically possible conjecture. As we have seen, advocates of the alphabetical interpretation have made use of this method here, but without satisfactory results. Dindorf, however, proceeded to employ his own

<sup>1</sup>Cf. schol. *Achar.* 67: τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωμῳδεῖν, γραφὲν ἐπὶ Μορυχίδον (440/39).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. *Harvard Studies* XV (1904), pp. 61 ff.

<sup>3</sup>Nevertheless, some have blindly adopted this explanation, cf. Böckh *CIG* I, p. 350b and O. K. Müller (Donaldson) *Hist. of Lit. of Anc. Greece* I, p. 449, n. 1.

advice and in a most convincing manner; cf. his Oxford edition of Aristophanes II, pp. 524 f.: "Est igitur qui in libris traditur numerus λέξις aperte corruptus et, si quid litterarum ductibus tribuendum, fortasse restituto λέξις corrigendus. Ita ad novem, quas Avibus antiquiores esse fabulas ex didascaliis constat, quinque aliae de ceteris accedere debebunt. Eae autem fortasse hae sunt, *Γεωργοί*, *Γῆρας*, *Εἰρήνη δευτέρα*, *Ολκάδες*, *Ταγηνισταί*. Ceterum λέξις ne tum quidem verum erit, si fabulas secundum litterarum ordinem numeraverit grammaticus: quod non est verisimile."

Between 427 B. C. and about 388 B. C. Aristophanes wrote forty plays, or one a year. Inasmuch as the *Birds* was produced in the fourteenth year of his career, a priori there is no difficulty involved in supposing it to have been fifteenth in chronological order. For his earlier years we have the following details:

<i>Banqueters</i>	427, Lenaea
<i>Babylonians</i>	426, City Dionysia
<i>Acharnians</i>	425, Lenaea
<i>Knights</i>	424, Lenaea
<i>Clouds A'</i>	423, City Dionysia
<i>Wasps</i>	422, Lenaea
<i>Peace A'</i>	421, City Dionysia
<i>Amphiaraus</i>	414, Lenaea
<i>Birds</i>	414, City Dionysia

To these must be added the unknown piece with which it seems likely that he won a City victory in 425.<sup>1</sup> To the list of plays suggested by Dindorf as belonging to this period must be added the *Δράματα ἡ Κένταυρος*.<sup>2</sup> For some of these plays there is room between 421 (*Pax A'*) and 414 (*Amphiaraus*), for, although Aristophanes seems to have then been less productive than earlier, there is no reason to believe that this was a period of complete inactivity.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Capps *A. J. P.* XXVIII (1907), p. 198.

<sup>2</sup> So Wilamowitz. The literature concerning this and the other plays in question is cited in Pauly-Wissowa II, 976 ff. In *arg. Vespa* there is a confused notice concerning Philonides and a *Ηροαγών*, which in my opinion ought not to be identified with Aristophanes' play of the same name; cf. Capps *A. J. P.* XXVIII (1907), p. 199.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Bergk (Meineke II, p. 995): "At vero ad illud tempus, quod inter Vespas et Aves intercedit, fere nullae fabulae referuntur, neque tamen per tam longum temporis spatium prorsus conticuisse Aristophanem consentaneum est;" and Pauly-Wissowa II, 979: "Sicher scheint nur, dass A. zwischen dem Frieden und dem nächst datierbaren Stück Amphiaraos nicht völlig pausiert hat, wenn wir auch die Lücke nicht ausfüllen können."

We have thus seen that the chronological interpretation falls short mainly at two points, viz., the *Antigone* and *Alcestis* numerals are somewhat smaller than we might expect (not a serious objection) and do not seem to conform to the tetralogic system used at the City Dionysia. Perhaps a study of the purpose of these numbers would assist us. Böckh<sup>1</sup> pointed out long ago that they were not official but due to private research, but further than this we have not been able to go. We are therefore fortunate in that the *Dionysalexandros* instance has at length made the purpose clear beyond reasonable doubt. This number is taken from an hypothesis. It was not, however, incorporated within it, but stood at the top of the second (last) column as a sort of heading and had doubtless appeared also at the beginning of the hypothesis (now lost). In my opinion, this was the original form of such a notice and shows why in the fuller form of statement found elsewhere a different verb is employed in each case—*ἐποιήθη*, *λέλεκται*, *ἔστι*. When Aristophanes of Byzantium, or whoever was responsible for the change, transferred these items from the heading and made them integral parts of the hypothesis, finding no verb in the original statement before him and resting under the necessity of now using one, he did not deem it essential to paraphrase the information always in the same way, but, as was natural, employed now one expression and now another.<sup>2</sup> If it be true that the original function of the numerals was as we find it in this *ὑπόθεσις*, only one explanation is possible—it is a device for the convenience of some library, probably that at Alexandria. If so, every play in the library would bear a number, and these numbers

<sup>1</sup>Cf. *CIG* I, p. 351a.

<sup>2</sup>Consequently, it is inadvisable to press the use of a particular word in any one case, cf. *Wex Antigone*, p. 35: "Fuerunt adeo qui . . . bis et trices eam (sc. *Antigonam*) in scaenam productam esse opinarentur, decepti scilicet male intellecta aliqua Aristophanis grammatici notatione in argumento fabulae, ubi dicit ille: *λέλεκται δὲ τὸ δράμα λβ'*, quod compendium legere illi volebant δοκιμητραχοντάκις;" Wilamowitz *Analecta Euripidea*, p. 133: "At *λέλεκται* illud lucem accipit ab Andronice de Platone verbis οὐτινος τὰ δράματα τάδε λέγονται, i. e. in catalogis recensentur;" and Ranke *De vita Aristophani*, p. clxvii: "Ipsa vox *λέλεκται* satis ostendit, non esse de doctis, sed de servatis lectisque fabulis dictum." This last is in embryo the theory which I have developed in the text; but it is here a mere guess unsupported by evidence, and is further hampered by being yoked with the alphabetical explanation, cf. *ibid.*, pp. ccxxii ff. Of course, *ἐποιήθη* lends itself most easily to a chronological interpretation; but the question must be decided upon broader grounds than that.

would run consecutively for each author. In other words, if any play were not represented in the collection, that fact would not be indicated by a gap being left for it in the enumeration. Of course, it is conceivable that the basis of arrangement was purely arbitrary, but it is more probable, until the contrary be proved, that some rational system (alphabetical, chronological, etc.) was employed. Now which system was actually chosen becomes clear when we note that the above statement of the numerals' purpose and use obviates the two objections to the chronological interpretation. For the extant fragments prove that of Euripides' ninety-two plays only about seventy-two were known to the Alexandrians. This test can always be accepted, when the conclusion is positive, and usually when it is negative. Thus, the Roman *Didascaliae* report that the *Bacchae* of Lysippus was the only play of his preserved and sure enough it is the only one from which we have quotations.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we are not surprised to learn from Suidas that seventy-eight plays of Euripides (four of them spurious) were preserved.<sup>2</sup> If the *Alcestis* was seventeenth among this number and retained the same relative position as in the original list, it must have been about the twentieth play Euripides brought out, which number (being a multiple of four) would be suitable for the last play of a tetralogy. Similarly, the hundred Sophoclean plays, which are preserved in whole or part make it seem likely that the *Antigone* was about the thirty-ninth play that he produced. These figures are, of course, mere estimates, but they have the merit of assigning a slightly larger number of plays to the earlier years of these poets and of affording a reasonable solution for these two misfit numerals. In the case of Cratinus and Aristophanes the fragments indicate that all their comedies were still extant in ancient times, and consequently these two numerals are not altered by the proposed interpretation.<sup>3</sup> Of

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *IG XIV*. 1097, and Capps *Class. Phil.* I (1906), p. 219, l. 9 and note.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Pauly-Wissowa VI, 1247.

<sup>3</sup> If the date I have assigned the *Dionysalexandros* should prove to be incorrect, that fact would not necessarily invalidate my interpretation of its numeral, for, (1) as only about a dozen of the twenty-six titles which Meineke accepted under the elder Cratinus' name are indisputably his, it is possible that several should be assigned to the younger poet, that not all the elder Cratinus' twenty-one plays were known to the

course, to render this hypothesis absolutely certain, one ought to arrange in chronological sequence such plays of these poets as the Alexandrians knew and to prove that the *Dionysalexandros* was eighth in Cratinus' series of twenty-one, the *Aves* fifteenth in Aristophanes' series of forty-four, the *Antigone* thirty-second in Sophocles' series of about one hundred, and the *Alcestis* seventeenth in Euripides' series of seventy-eight.<sup>1</sup> But our meager didascalic information puts such a procedure entirely out of the question, and we must be content to have shown that such a theory satisfies the general probabilities of the case.

The question at once arises where second versions would be placed in such an enumeration as we have been considering. If the second version had actually been produced, its number would naturally correspond to its chronological position. But if it had merely been published and were included in the library collection, it would still have to have a number, and I am of the opinion that, no matter how long an interval had intervened between the production of the first version and the publication of the second, the latter's library number would immediately follow that of the former. Such a supposition would explain the source of the misinformation in arg. V *Nubes*. The extant fragments and the fact that the differences between the two versions are so clearly distinguished in arg. VI prove that both were preserved in Alexandrian times. The anonymous author of arg. V correctly tells us that the first *Clouds* was produced at the City Dionysia in 423 and was awarded the third place, and then incorrectly adds that Aristophanes brought out the second edition in the following year and was still less successful (*ἀποτυχὼν πολὺ μᾶλλον*). Anonymous probably reasoned as follows:

Alexandrians, and that the *Dionys.* was eighth (chronologically) among those preserved, or (2) it is possible that Cratinus was much more productive than is commonly supposed, that only twenty-one of his plays were known to the Alexandrians, and that thirteen preserved plays belonged to the period after 430-429.

<sup>1</sup> Extant fragments prove that the Alexandrians were acquainted with Euripides' *Pleadies* (with which he made his maiden appearance), and *Cressae*, *Alceon in Psophis*, and *Telephus* (which came out with the *Alcestis*). These plays, then, would be numbers 1, 14, 15, and 16, respectively. He is known to have won his first victory in 441, and there is no doubt that these plays (or some of them) are represented in our fragments, if we only knew how to pick them out. The satyric plays would probably be the first to disappear, cf. arg. *Medea*.

My edition of *Νεφέλαι* A' bears such and such a number and the records show that it was third in 423. My edition of *Νεφέλαι* B' bears a number larger by one than the other, but the *Didascaliae* say nothing about it. The numeral indicates that the second edition came out the year after the first. I explain the silence of the records by supposing that, although the practice of having five poets compete at a time obtained,<sup>1</sup> it was at this time the custom to record the names of only the three highest contestants. Therefore, I conclude [we may represent *Anonymous* as saying] that in his second attempt Aristophanes fared still worse than before and was awarded fourth or fifth place.

We thus obtain an adequate and plausible explanation for an error that has caused scholars much trouble.

It remains to point out that such an arrangement as I have suggested would not have seemed an unnatural thing to the ancients. Terence's plays, for example, are not only arranged in that way in our MSS but are given numerals on that basis in the *Didascaliae*. It is interesting to note that there was some uncertainty as to what should be done in the case of a play that failed and was repeated, like the *Hecyra*. The MSS arrangement ignores the first production of that play (after the *Andria*), when it was scarcely more than begun, and gives it a position corresponding to the second exhibition (after the *Phormio*); doubtless because on this second occasion a considerable portion of the play was presented, although it was not produced *in toto* until the third attempt (after the *Adelphoe*). Nevertheless, the didascalic numeral assigned the *Heauton* is III, as if the first exhibition of the *Hecyra* were to be counted. The *Eunuchus*, however, is likewise given the number III, and the other numerals follow its lead. The Terence numbers, of course, trace back the system only to the Romans and to about the time of Varro. Aeschines' speeches, however, are also arranged in this way, so that there is no doubt the Alexandrian Greeks were familiar with such arrangements. Wilamowitz's objection,<sup>2</sup> "At haud probabile aut certe non probatum est apud scaenicos Graecos umquam eandem disponendi rationem usu venisse. catalogi enim, unicus, unde aliquid

<sup>1</sup> Both before and after the Peloponnesian War the number of competitors seems to have been five, but for a time in the interim only three, cf. Capps *Class. Phil.* (1906) p. 219, n. on l. 5.

<sup>2</sup> *Analecta Euripidea*, p. 132.

sciri potest, fons nullum ordinem norunt praeter eum, qui ex literis principalibus titulorum fabulas digerit (*κατὰ στοιχεῖον*)," overrides the very evidence we have been considering.

To summarize: If we follow Dindorf in reading  $\iota\epsilon'$  for  $\lambda\epsilon'$  in arg. *Aves*, the numbers are capable of a uniform interpretation. They were a library device and were assigned the plays represented in the Alexandrian collection according to the date of their production. A second version of a play, if only published and not actually produced, was given a number immediately following that of the first version—a practice which explains the error of Anonymous arg. V *Nubes* concerning the second *Clouds*. At least nineteen plays of Euripides preceded the *Alcestis*. Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* was probably brought out in 445 B. C.

#### APPENDIX

There are still two other numerals which used to be considered in this connection: and although they are now commonly disregarded and I have made no use of them in the preceding discussion, I do not feel free in a paper of such length to neglect them entirely.

1. Bekker *Anecdota Graeca*, p. 430. 15: *ἀπολογίσασθαι καὶ ἀπολογίζειν τὸ ἐπεξελθεῖν ἔκαστα. Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τῷ θ Γύρῳ*.

*ἔγώ δ' ἀπολογίζειν τε, καὶ τ' ἐπ' ἀνθράκων.*

This condensed manner of citing the numeral has naturally aroused suspicion. Accordingly, Dindorf (II, p. 583) deleted the phrase *ἐν τῷ θ*, and Meineke (V, p. 61 f.) accepted Fritzsche's reading (*ἀπολογίζειν* for *ἀπολογίζων*) in the quotation, and saw a fusion of two separate notices—the first is complete and ends with *ἔκαστα*; the rest of the text belongs to the *lemma ἀπολογίζειν*, which had accidentally fallen out. For *ἐν τῷ θ* Meineke substituted *ἐν τῷ ο*, which has reference to the spelling.<sup>1</sup> These changes were accepted by Kock (I, p. 425) and Blaydes (*Fragmenta*, p. 65). But however attractive they may be, we must remember that so short a quotation gives us no idea of the context and that without a context emendation must proceed with extreme caution. In any case, however, this numeral (if such it is)<sup>2</sup> need not concern us much, since it is capable of both an alphabetical and chronological interpretation.

2. Photius, p. 426. 12: *πέτευρον τὸν τὸ μακρὸν καὶ ὑπόπλατον καὶ μετέωρον ξύλον. Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν τῷ ε.* Pollux x. 156: *πέτευρον δέ, οὐ τὰς ἐνοικι-*

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Photius, p. 230. 19: *λοπίζειν οὐ λεπίζειν.*

<sup>2</sup>It is still cited as such by Christ (Schmidt) *Geschichte d. griech. Literatur*, p. 403, n. 2 (5th ed.). Cf. Süvern *Über Aristophanis Γῆρας*, p. 24.

δίας ὅρνθας ἐγκαθεύδειν συμβίβηκεν, Ἀριστοφάνης λέγει, ὥσπερ καὶ κρεμάστραν ἐν ταῖς Νεφέλαις. Bothe<sup>1</sup> seems to have been the first to bring this passage into the discussion and from the comparison with the Pollux passage drew the very natural inference that ἕ was referred to the *Clouds* in a chronological arrangement—*Banqueters* 427, *Babylonians* 426, *Acharnians* 425, *Knights* 424, and *Clouds* 423. The difficulty is that, while *κρεμάστρα* occurs in the *Clouds* in the form *κρεμάθρα* (l. 218), *πέτευρον* apparently does not; and it has accordingly been cited among the *fragmenta fabularum incertarum* by Dindorf II, p. 696; Meineke (Bergk) II, p. 1218; and Kock I, p. 582. Two problems confront us and it would be well to consider them separately: (a) does *πέτευρον* occur in the *Clouds* and, if so, (b) does ἐν τῷ ἕ refer to the number of that play or merely to the spelling of the word (*πέτευρον*, not *πέταυρον*).

Does *πέτευρον* occur in the *Clouds*? Ranke<sup>2</sup> long ago proposed to change *Nubes* 226:

ἴπειτ<sup>3</sup> ἀπὸ ταρροῦ τοὺς θεοὺς ὑπερφρονεῖς

so as to read:

ἴπειτ<sup>3</sup> ἀπὸ πετεύρου κτλ.

This is going too far, but in my opinion Ranke has indicated the path to follow. Possibly *πέτευρον* is not a genuine Greek word at all but merely a corruption introduced into the text (and incidentally the language) through a failure to observe that the last letter of *ἴπειτ* was elided. The resulting coinage naturally gained some circulation, but outside of the lexicographers (Pollux, Photius, and Suidas) the word does not occur half a dozen times and then always in the later literature. The alternative spelling (*πέταυρον*) lies nearer *ποταρροῦ* paleographically and was probably the original form, *πέτευρον* being due to a supposed connection with *εῦδειν*.<sup>4</sup> Photius, of course, simply borrowed the phrase *ἐν τῷ ἕ* from some older authority, and if ἕ here really is a numeral, it could easily have been misunderstood in ancient as in modern times and so hastened the change to the spelling *πέτευρον*. If we believe the corrupted text to have read *ἴπειτα πετεύρον* where the genitive is ablative (cf. ὅχοι, Soph. *Oed. Rex* 808), my explanation gains plausibility. But however this may be, I think there can be little doubt that Pollux and Photius had this line of the *Clouds* in mind. This conclusion is confirmed also by the similarity of their explanations with that of the scholiast *ad loc.*<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Aristophanis dramatum fragmenta* (1844), p. 44, where is likewise a partial anticipation of Meineke's interpretation of the Γῆρας passage.

<sup>2</sup> *De vita Aristophanis*, p. edii. Ranke's conjecture is cited with halting approval in Teuffel's edition (1856), p. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Suidas s. v. *πέταυρον*: *παγίς*: βάθος: *σαρίς*: *οἰον πέτευδον*, *παρὰ τὸ εὖδειν ἐν τῷ τὰ πετεύρᾳ*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. sch. *Nubes* 226: *ταρρός*: *μετέωρον τι ἵκριον ἐφ' οὐδὲν αἱ ἀλεκτρυνοῦδες κοιμῶνται* (Rutherford) and the Pollux passage in the text. Note also *μετέωρον* *ξύλον* in Photius.

Does ἐν τῷ ἡ refer to the number of the *Clouds* or to the spelling of πέτευρον? Opinions differ. Bergk thought ἡ a numeral but that the *Clouds* was not the play referred to.<sup>1</sup> There is a pronounced tendency, however, to believe that the phrase has reference to the spelling.<sup>2</sup> This view is certainly possible, although a cursory examination of a portion of Photius has not yielded me a precise parallel. Hilberg cites σινάμωρος· ἐν τῷ ἡ ὁὐχὶ σινόμωρος. But of course this is infinitely more explicit than the instance under consideration, and the same objection can be lodged against the nearest parallels my hasty search discovered. Cf.<sup>3</sup> ἀδαξήσου-τὸ κνήσα, οὐν ἐν τῷ ὁὐδὲν ὀδαξήσου . . . . 'Αριστοφάντης ἐν Ὀλκάσιν, and ἀλοάσαντα: ἐν τῷ ἡ Φερεκράτης Ἰπνῷ . . . . ἀλοήσου ἐν τῷ ἡ.

On the other hand, parallels to justify interpreting ἕ as a numeral are little more convincing. Plays are regularly cited in the dative case either with or without the preposition ἐν. Sometimes the two constructions occur side by side, cf. *ἀμυγδαλῆ . . . Ἐρμιππος Φορμοφόροις καὶ Φιλήμων ἐν Μύστιοι καὶ Δίφιλος Τελεσία*. But, of course, no numerals are used in this connection. They are employed, however, in referring to the books of histories, dialogues, etc., cf. ἀγῶνα Θουκυδῆς ἕ “προελθὼν εἰς τὸν ἀγῶνα” κτλ. [Thuc. v. 50]; ἀναθολῶντι ἀναταράξι, Νόμους ζ Πλάτων [Laws 824b]; ἀθνεία Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῷ ἀ αὐτῷ λόγῳ τὴν ἀτυχίαν λέγει [Herod. i. 37]; αἰματιά . . . δηλοῖ δὲ Ἡρόδοτος ἐν τῇ ἀ [Herod. i. 180]. These parallels, though not entirely satisfactory, are yet close enough to prove that ἕ might possibly be a numeral. Further than this it is neither possible nor necessary to go. The *Clouds* may have been Aristophanes' fifth piece, though, if so, we must reject the City victory in 425. The important point is that the chronological interpretation can readily accommodate itself to the possibility of the *Clouds* being Aristophanes' fifth play. To the supporters of the alphabetical explanation, however, such a possibility is disconcerting, since in an alphabetical list the *Clouds* would be number twenty-seven.<sup>4</sup>

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

<sup>1</sup> Meineke II, p. 1218; contrast p. 1000.

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Dindorf II, p. 696; Hilberg *Zeit.f. österr. Gym.* XXX (1879), p. 906; Kock I, p. 582.

<sup>3</sup> All the Photius quotations that follow are taken from the new text published by Reitzenstein *Der Anfang des Lexicons der Photios*.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Capps suggests the following: the original text was ΕΝΤΩΝΕΦΕΛΑΙΣ ΑΡΑΜΑΤΙ, which was shortened to ΕΝΤΩΝΕ and then corrupted to ΕΝΤΩΝΕ.

## STUDIES IN THE MSS. OF THE THIRD DECADE OF LIVY

By F. W. SHIPLEY

### IV. THE DATE OF THE CORRECTIONS BY ERASURE IN THE PUTEANUS

In his critical edition August Luchs has distinguished with great care the corrections of the various hands in the Puteanus. He has taken pains to indicate that the corrections of  $P^2$  and  $P^3$  are earlier than the copying of Vat. Reg., and are therefore earlier than the ninth century,<sup>1</sup> and has at least implied that  $P^4$  and  $P^5$  are later. Not least in importance among the corrections in P is a series of corrections by erasure, which are, in general, much more carefully made and much less superficial than the other corrections in the manuscript. It is quite as important, therefore, to know whether these erasures are late or early as it is to know the relative antiquity of the other corrections. The date of these erasures cannot, of course, be established from a study of P alone, nor has Luchs attempted to do so except in a few instances in which he has wrongfully ascribed the erasures to  $P^1$ . Vat. Reg., however, the ninth-century copy of P, serves to establish a *terminus ante quem* and a *terminus post quem* for these erasures, and to divide those which are early from those which are late. In fact, as will be seen from the appended lists, its readings show that the great majority of the erasures in P are at least as late as, if not later than, the ninth century.

In the following lists I have distinguished between the early corrections by erasure and those which are late in the hope that the knowledge of the relative antiquity of the erasures may be of service to students of Livy. The numbers refer to book, chapter, and section of Luchs' critical edition of 1888-89 (Weidmann, Berlin), Vol. III containing Books xxi-xxv and Vol. IV, Books xxvi-xxx. The accounts of the erasures in P are given exactly as they appear in the critical apparatus of Luchs' edition. Those marked with

<sup>1</sup> This had been already stated by Wölfflin in *Philologus*, XXXIII, pp. 186-89.

an asterisk (\*) are wrongly stated by him, and will be found corrected in paper v, § 1.

As already stated in the introduction to this series of papers, my study of Vat. Reg. was undertaken with the purpose of securing concrete illustrations of the errors made by ninth-century scribes in copying uncial manuscripts. It was not necessary for my purpose that my collation should cover the whole manuscript. There are in consequence three short gaps in my record of the readings of Vat. Reg. namely, from xxiv. 40, 15 to xxv. 9, 9, from xxviii. 37, 9 to xxviii. 39, 16, and from xxviii. 41, 16, to xxix. 1, 24. These passages comprise 20 pages, 3 pages, and 10 pages respectively.

I have not thought it necessary to include those erasures over which the scribe of P has himself written, and which are therefore to be ascribed to P<sup>1</sup>.

1. In the following passages the readings of Vat. Reg. correspond with the corrections by erasure in P. The erasures in P are therefore either contemporaneous with, or earlier than, the copying of Vat. Reg.

Lib. xxii: 51, 2, *quinto ras. ex quinquo*.

Lib. xxiv: 22, 11, *aspernatus in aspertatus mut. P<sup>1</sup> sed ras. illud restitutum* || 27, 1, *hae ras. ex haec* || 29, 6, *uertere ras. ex uerteret* || 36, 7, *et ras. ex etet* || 37, 1, *arcibus ras. ex argibus*.

Lib. xxv: 14, 9, *uires ras. ex urres* || 16, 23, *parci ras. ex parcit* || 18, 15, *militumi | litum P<sup>1</sup> secunda m a P<sup>2</sup> inducta est et litt. litum erasae* || 19, 14, *alterum uincendo ueteranum bis scr. P<sup>1</sup>, priore loco a P<sup>2</sup> del., altero ex parte erasae* || 24, 7, *prope prope P<sup>1</sup>, prope P<sup>2</sup> t inter p et e super scripta rursus erasae* || 25, 11, *tumultum ex tumulum P<sup>1</sup>, nunc ras. tumultum restitutum* || 32, 10, *partem ras. ex partem hasdrubal bella partem* || 41, 10, *manneret ras. ex manereret*.

Lib. xxvii: 12, 8, *mouit ras. ex mouit castra* || 12, 10, *conlata ras. ex conlocata* || 22, 8, *sicilia ras. ex siciliae* || 25, 2, *tarentinique ras. ex taren tinisque* || 32, 8, *acceptum ras. ex agceptum* || 43, 4, *tr ras. ex trī*.

Lib. xxviii: 2, 16, *traiceret ras. ex traigeret* || 5, 12, *scopyssam P<sup>1</sup> scopussam P<sup>2</sup> sed ras. illud restituit* || 7, 4, *direptum ras. ex direptuum* || 23, 6, *pollicentes P<sup>1</sup>, lineola a P<sup>2</sup> per s ducta et littera quaedam super scripta nunc erasae* || 23, 6, *punicamquae P<sup>1</sup>, lineola qua P<sup>2</sup> posteriorem a deleuerat erasa* || 32, 3, *quo P, d super o addita nunc erasa est* || 35, 1, *ac tantum ras. ex ae tantum*.

Lib. xxix: 2, 17, *quod nunc erasum* || 11, 4, *ut ras. ex et ut* || 18, 13,

legato *ras.* *ex legatos* || 27, 2, romanae *P<sup>1</sup>* romano *P<sup>2</sup>* *sed ras.* *illud restit.* *est* || 27, 15, secus *P<sup>1</sup>*, *c in g mut.* *et ante c quaedam superscr.* *P<sup>2</sup> nunc utraque erasa sunt* || 33, 5, *syphaci ras.* *ex syphagi.*

Lib. xxx: 4, 5, nauiter *ras.* *ex inaniter.*

2. In the passages given in the following list, the scribes of Vat. Reg. have written in full the letters erased in *P*. The erasures are therefore without question as late as, if not later than, the ninth century.

Lib. xxii: 21, 4, *tribus militibus P ante ras.* *tribus milibus post ras.* || 30, 1, *dicatoris ras.* *ex dicacatoris uel dictatoris\** || 49, 16, *seruilius ras.* *ex seruilius* || *minucium P<sup>1</sup> minucius P<sup>2</sup>, sed s rursus erasa* || 49, 17, *aut ante senatores P post ras.* *autte P<sup>1</sup>, auttem P<sup>2</sup>.*

Lib. xxiii: 43, 5, *ire noiam P<sup>1</sup>, renouato iam P<sup>2</sup>, sed illud postea ras.* *restitutum est* || 44, 4, *pugnanti P, sed ti ex parte erasae* || 45, 5, *exprobrandam ante ras.* *exprobranda post ras.* || 46, 5, *sepeliendo ras.* *ex sepellendo\** || 46, 7, *ager P<sup>1</sup>, agere P<sup>2</sup>, sed ras.* *ager restit.* || 46, 10, *coacti sunt campani ras.* *ex coactis sunt campania* || 46, 14, *secunda ras.* *ex secundae* || 46, 14, *opima ras.* *ex opimas* || 47, 1, *nuntiata ras.* *ex nuntiatas* || 48, 4, *qua ras.* *ex quam.*

Lib. xxiv: 3, 14, *intrassent ras.* *ex inistrassent* || 5, 11, *postremo ras.* *ex postremos* || 7, 1, *milibus ras.* *ex militibus* || 7, 4, *uni ras.* *ex uini* || 7, 1, *dinomini P<sup>1</sup>, indimini P<sup>2</sup>, duae litterae ante m superscriptae nunc erasae sunt\** || 8, 1, *laxior P<sup>1</sup> anxior P<sup>2</sup> sed illud ras.* *restitutum* || 8, 17, *exemplo ras.* *ex exemplo* || 8, 19, *edictum ras.* *ex tediectum* || 11, 1, *deum ras.* *ex indeum* || 11, 6, *c ras.* *ex g* || 12, 3, *trepidem P<sup>1</sup> trepida P<sup>2</sup> postea ras.* *trepide effectum* || 12, 5, *maximas P<sup>1</sup> maxime P<sup>2</sup> sed ras.* *illud restitutum* || 14, 2, *posuisse ras.* *ex posuisset* || 14, 3, *enumquā P<sup>1</sup> numquā P<sup>2</sup> sed postea ras.* *illud restit.* || 14, 10, *nauatae P<sup>1</sup> nouatae P<sup>2</sup> sed postea ras.* *illud restit.* || 16, 13, *morbus P<sup>1</sup>, moribus P<sup>2</sup>, sed postea ras.* *illud restit.* || 16, 19, *pingi ras.* *ex pingui* || 18, 1, *minore ras.* *ex minores* || 23, 8, *romamanis P<sup>1</sup> romam armis P<sup>2</sup> postea ras.* *romanis effectum* || 23, 8, *perducantur P<sup>1</sup>, perducant P<sup>2</sup> sed ras.* *illud restit.* || 24, 2, *cū ras.* *ex eū* || 24, 4, *conpererunt P<sup>1</sup> conperierunt P<sup>2</sup> sed ras.* *illud restit.* || 25, 1, *fecisse ras.* *ex fecisset* || 26, 14, *caedē* | *quidese P, sed se nunc erasum* || 28, 6, *infideli P<sup>1</sup> infidelem P<sup>2</sup> postea ras.* *illud restit.* || 29, 2, *multi ras.* *ex multis* || 29, 6, *uertere ras.* *ex uerteret* || 35, 4, *nequaquam ras.* *ex nequamquam* || 36, 9, *tereret ras.* *ex terroreret* || 37, 6, *portarum ras.* *ex portarumque* || 37, 9, *esse ras.* *ex esset* || 37, 10, *libertatis ras.* *ex libertatis* || 39, 7, *retenta ras.* *ex retentā* || 40, 3, *tardior ras.* *ex tardiore* || . . . . I have no record of the readings of Vat. Reg. from xxiv. 40, 15, to xxv. 9, 9.

Lib. xxv: 9, 15, *sese ras.* *ex sesse* || 10, 10, *concepione P<sup>1</sup>, concilione P<sup>2</sup> inde rasura concione* || 11, 5, *alia apparatu P<sup>1</sup> alio apparatu*

P<sup>2</sup> sed postea ras. illud restit. || 11, 20, statum ras. ex istatum || 12, 6, fuat P<sup>1</sup> fluat P<sup>2</sup> sed postea ras. illud restit. || 12, 7, campos ras. ex campost || 12, 7, locis ras. ex lociis || 13, 3, exercitu ras. ex exercitum || 14, 4, arreptum P<sup>1</sup> eruptum P<sup>2</sup>, sed prior e rursus erasa || 14, 11, x ras. ex ex || 15, 6, liberati ras. ex libertati || 15, 6, ora ras. ex mora || 18, 4, crispino badius P<sup>1</sup>, sr a P<sup>2</sup> inter o et b superscr. nunc eras. || 18, 4, hospes ras. ex hocspes || 19, 14, sememem P<sup>1</sup>, seinmem P<sup>2</sup> ante ras. semermem post ras. || 20, 5, alterius ras. ex alterius || 20, 6, nulla ras. ex nullam || 21, 10, ut ras. ex aut || 22, 1, hae ras. ex haec || 22, 4, cura ras. ex curam || 22, 8, circumdare ras. ex circumdaret || 22, 9, contineret ras. ex continerent || 22, 14, id ras. ex td || 22, 16, spe ras. ex ispe || 23, 11, saepius ras. ex saepitis || 23, 12, pristina ras. ex pristinae || 23, 12, scalis ras. ex sealis || 24, 12, deleti ras. ex delecti || 25, 11, tempestatis ras. ex tempestatis || 26, 8, auerteret ras. ex auerteret et || 27, 1, delecto ras. ex delecto || 27, 1, abest eo P<sup>1</sup> ab osteo P<sup>2</sup>, sed ras. illud rest. || 27, 4, uentos P<sup>1</sup> euentos P<sup>2</sup> sed ras. illud rest. || 28, 1, epicyden ras. ex epicydens || 29, 9, arreptisque arreptisq. P<sup>1</sup> arreptisque P<sup>2</sup> quod nunc erasum est || 30, 11, e ras. ex se || 32, 8, tertia ras. ex tertiae || 32, 8, adiunctis ras. ex adiunctis || 36, 16, cnaeum P b supra u scripta rursus erasa || 37, 1, deleti ras. ex delectis || 37, 13, haec ras. ex haec || 39, 3, ignes ras. ex signae || 39, 7, captis ras. ex capitis || 39, 7, altera ras. ex alteram.

Lib. xxvi: 3, 8, more ras. ex morte || 4, 3, nequaquam ras. ex nequaq. dā || 4, 3, uince P<sup>1</sup> uincere P<sup>2</sup> sed ras. uince restitutum est || 4, 5, se ras. ex ses || 4, 10, q. ras. ex quin || 5, 8, quae ras. ex quae || 8, 4, yre ras. ex tyre || 8, 6, qui ras. ex quiq. || 8, 7, opsideretur ras. ex opsiderentur || 11, 12, breuis ras. ex breuius || 12, 18, litteraeque ras. ex litteraeque || 12, 19, manibusque ras. ex manibusque || 13, 18, a cruciatu ras. ex aescruciati || 15, 9, perusat ras. ex persuasit || 15, 10, tum ras. ex tuum || 15, 10, legatae ras. ex legataes || 16, 8, ager ras. ex aeger || 17, 5, esset ras. ex essetset || 17, 7, atq. ras. in a mut. P || 18, 10, impetus ras. ex imperat impetus || 19, 4, sine ras. ex sitne || 21, 4, meriti ras. ex meritis || 21, 7, uis P<sup>1</sup> uas P<sup>2</sup> nunc ras. uis restitutum || 22, 8, requiesce ras. ex requiescem || 22, 18, marcellu ras. ex marcellus || 22, 15, consulere ras. ex consulere || 24, 13, etholis ras. ex etholiis || 24, 15, satis ras. ex satiss || 25, 2, altergo ras. ex saltergo P<sup>1</sup> alterno P<sup>2</sup>\* || 25, 5, perseo ras. ex perseo || 26, 8, corneliu ras. ex cornelius || 47, 2, enixae ras. ex enixae.

Lib. xxvii: 2, 5, tanta ras. ex tantae || 5, 11, masinissa ras. ex masilissa || 12, 5, agathyrna ras. ex agathyrana || 12, 13, adortattionibus ras. ex adportattionibus || 15, 7, parataeque ras. ex parataequae || 15, 14, tubae ras. ex turbae || 18, 2, itinere ras. ex ititinere || 18, 4, tantum ras. ex tantum | tantum || 18, 10, iubet ras. ex iuberet || 19, 7, eligere ras. ex eligeret || 19, 10, masinissa ras. ex masinissam || 21, 5, ti ras. ex tum || 21, 5, quitu ras. ex quintu || 21, 6 optinebat ras. ex optinebant || 21, 7,

exercitu *ras.* *ex exercitum* || 21, 9, in singulos *ras.* *ex sinsingulos* || 25, 5, adiecit *ras.* *ex addiecit* || 26, 9, romani *ras.* *ex romanis* || 27, 11, prudentia *ras.* *ex prudentiae* || 28, 1, iniectum *ras.* *ex infectum* || 28, 13, sua et *ras.* *ex suā* et || 28, 14, nuntiata *ras.* *ex nuntiatā* || 28, 17, aduentu *ras.* *ex aduentū* || 30, 4, atheniensibus rhodiisque et ateniensibus P<sup>1</sup>, *ubi* rhodiis *erasum est*, et ateniensibus *delevit* P<sup>2\*</sup> || 38, 8, die *ras.* *ex diei* || 35, 14, mutauerunt P<sup>1</sup> mutauerunt P<sup>2</sup> *sed ras.* *illud restit.* || 37, 15, xuiris *ras.* *ex xuiriss* || 38, 10, undeuiensimam P<sup>1</sup>, am a P<sup>2</sup> *super de scriptum rursum erasum* || 39, 31, raptim *ras.* *ex raptum* || 41, 5, hannibal *ras.* *ex hannibale* || 43, 10, aduescendum *ras.* *ex adsuescendum* || 44, 3, abesse *ras.* *ex abesset* || 46, 1, tessera P<sup>1</sup> *lineola a P<sup>2</sup> per t ducta rursus erasa* || 49, 4, superstes P<sup>1</sup> superesset P<sup>2</sup> *sed ras.* *illud restit.* || 49, 4, esset P<sup>1</sup> *del P<sup>2</sup>, sed ras.* *illud restit.* || 49, 7, haudquaquam *ras.* *ex haudquamquam* || 51, 4, cum alii *ras.* *ex cum aliis.*

Lib. xxviii: 1, 9, citato *ras.* *ex scitato* || 2, 3, cum *ras.* *ex eum* || 2, 6, romani *ras.* *ex romanis* || 2, 8, binique *ras.* *ex libidinique* || 4, 2, captam P<sup>6</sup>, capiam P<sup>1</sup> *cum ras.* *super priorem a (fuit fortasse ā)\** || 7, 3, a *ras.* *ex ad* || 7, 3, milia *ras.* *ex millia* || 7, 12, fidē *ras.* *ex fidē|m* || 7, 18, acaranum *ras.* *ex aearanum* || 7, 18, oreo *ras.* *ex eoreo* || 12, 13, dilectibus *ras.* *ex directibus* || 15, 9, effuderunt *ras.* *ex effunderunt* || 17, 16, ciere *ras.* *ex clere* || 18, 6, inerat *ras.* *ex inierat* || 21, 9, rabis P<sup>1</sup> *inde ras.* rabie *uidetur factum* || 24, 1, audierat *ras.* *ex auditerat* || 24, 7, primones P<sup>1</sup> primores P<sup>2</sup> *sed ras.* *illud restit.* || 24, 14, neque *ras.* *ex nequem* || 24, 16, fore *ras.* *ex forae* || 25, 4, permulcentibus *ras.* *ex permulgentibus* || 25, 11, quies *ras.* *ex quiesce* || 25, 11, mandonius *ras.* *ex mandoinius* P<sup>1</sup>, at a P<sup>2</sup> *inter do superscriptum rursus erasum\** || 25, 13, malis *ras.* *ex malii* || 25, 15, singulane *ras.* *ex singulanec* || 27, 3, ad *ras.* *ex adut* || 30, 5, quinqueremem P *duae ultimae litterae lineola inductae sed ras.* *restitutae sunt* || 31, 2, terere *ras.* *ex terrere* || 31, 5, quieuerunt *ras.* *ex quieuenerrunt* || 31, 5, posse *ras.* *ex posset* || 33, 8, colle *ras.* *ex colles* || 33, 11, a *ras.* *ex ad* || 33, 13, censere P<sup>1</sup>, cernere P<sup>2</sup> *sed ras.* *censere restit.* || 33, 15, pedes *ras.* *ex pedites* || 34, 2, ducenti *ras.* *ex ducentū* || 35, 41, remisso *ras.* *ex remisso* || 35, 12, equitatu *ras.* *ex equitatum* || 36, 7, causa *ras.* *ex causā* || 37, 2, iussit *ras.* *ex tussit* . . . . I have no record of the readings of Vat. Reg. from 37, 9, to 39, 16. . . . . 39, 17, vestra *ras.* *ex vestrae* || 40, 4, prouinciam *sed m ex parte erasa* || 41, 5, italia *ras.* *ex ita alia* || 41, 8, circuitus *ras.* *ex circumitus* || 41, 10, ultra *ras.* *ex ultra* || 41, 11, alere *ras.* *ex alterae* || . . . . I have no record of the readings of Vat. Reg. from 41, 16 to xxix, 1, 24.

Lib. xxix: 4, 6, carthagine P<sup>1</sup>, i a P<sup>4</sup> *per e ducta rursus erasa* || 8, 11, uiolatione *ras.* *ex utolatione* || 12, 12, adfuit *ras.* *ex adfuit* || 12, 14, prusia *ras.* *ex prusia* || 14, 4, procurandorum *ras.* *ex procursandorum* || 15, 5, sutrio P, s *expuncta sed ras.* *restituta est* || 21, 9, legatisque *ras.* *ex legatusque* || 21, 11, habeant P<sup>6</sup> abeant *ras.* *ex liabeant* P<sup>1\*</sup> || 21, 12, iis *ras.* *ex siis* ||

23, 6, si *ras. ex* sit || 23, 7, recenti *ras. ex* regenti || 23, 7, adhibitis *ras. ex* adhanbitis || 23, 10, qua *ras. ex* quae || 23, 10, patria *ras. ex* patriam || 31, 11, mare P<sup>1</sup> r del P<sup>2</sup>, *littera quaedam superscripta nunc erasa\** || 32, 2, a *ras. ex* ea || 34, 4, hoste P<sup>2</sup> sed *ras. hostem restit.* || 34, 14, recentibus *ras. ex* regentibus || 35, 12, abscederet *ras. ex* ascenderet || 37, 6, censa P<sup>1</sup> cesa P<sup>2</sup> sed *ras. illud restit.* || 37, 14, xxx *ras. ex* xxxx.

Lib. xxx: 2, 7, cum *ras. ex* eum || 2, 8, iussi *ras. ex* iussu || 2, 12, linea *ras. ex* lineam || 3, 10, scipioni *ras. ex* scipionis || 4, 12, cum *ras. ex* eum.

Vat. Reg. ends xxx. 5, 7 continua amplexus.

3. In a small number of cases one cannot absolutely depend upon this criterion for dating the erasures in P either because the reading of Vat. Reg. occasionally diverges both from the original reading of P and the correction by erasure, or because correctors in Vat. Reg. have obliterated the original reading in that MS. Where the reading of Vat. Reg. furnishes a reasonable ground for assuming that the correction in P is later than the copying of Vat. Reg., I have indicated this by an asterisk. The readings of Vat. Reg. are designated by the letter R.

xxiii. 43, 10, obtegerit P<sup>1</sup> obtegit P *post rasuram, obtegeuit manus quaedam satis recens; obtege R<sup>1</sup>, obteget manus posterior.*

\*xxiv. 36, 7, habentibus P<sup>1</sup> habentantibus P<sup>2</sup> *postea ras. habentibus effectum; habitantibus R<sup>1</sup>, aduetantibus manus posterior.*

\*xxv. 16, 18, circumuentis *in circumuentus mut. P<sup>1</sup>, nunc ras. illud restit.; circumuentis in circumuentus mut. R<sup>1</sup>.*

xxvi. 19, 1, qua *ras. ex* quaui P; qua *in quaui mut. R<sup>1</sup>, nunc ras. qua restit.*

\*xxvii. 21, 5, postero die *ras. ex* posterodiei P; postero die R<sup>1</sup>, postero diei *manus posterior.*

As *postero diei* is incorrect, and *postero die* right, it is probable that the scribe of Reg. made the correction for himself, and that the later correction to *diei* was made before the erasure took place in P.

xxvii. 32, 3, inter P<sup>1</sup>, *lineola a P<sup>2</sup> per t ducta et duae uel tres litterae super n superscriptae nunc erasae sunt; inti R<sup>1</sup>, post quod aliquot litterae erasae et a manu posteriore intiner effectum.*

xxviii. 19, 18, qua *ras. ex* quae P; qua R<sup>1</sup>, qua *manus posterior.*

xxix. 10, 5, pissinunte P<sup>1</sup>, a scipione signum e P<sup>2</sup> *ante ras., aspissi-nunte post ras.; pissinum e R.*

xxix. 32, 4, oppositis *ras. ex* oppositus P; oppositos R.

V. SOME ERRATA AND OMISSIONS IN THE REPORT OF THE READINGS  
OF P IN THE CRITICAL APPARATUS OF AUGUST LUCHS

In comparing the readings of Vat. Reg. and the Puteanus I discovered occasional errors and omissions in the record of the readings of the Puteanus as given by Luchs in his critical apparatus.<sup>1</sup> As the collation of Luchs is the best and most authoritative, I offer these additions and corrections in the hope that they may be of use to future editors. But, since my study of the Puteanus was chiefly paleographical, I lay no claim whatever to a thorough revision of Luchs' collation; nor do I desire to impeach the general accuracy of that editor. His work has been exceedingly careful, and actual oversights are very rare. Most of the corrections here offered are based upon the additional evidence of Vat. Reg. which is of great assistance in determining the original readings of the Puteanus where the writing or marks of correction have become faint, or where erasures have been made since Vat. Reg. was copied. In such passages Luchs has sometimes been led astray by the attempt to identify correctors upon insufficient data.

1. In corrections by erasure Luchs has often been unable to decipher the erased letters, and has ventured guesses which the readings of Vat. Reg., copied before the letters were erased, show to be wrong. A list is given below.

(The corrected report of the readings of P will be found in the right-hand column; in the left, the reading as reported by Luchs. Where my correction turns upon the reading of Vat. Reg., the reading of that MS is given in brackets in the left-hand column.)

READING OF P AS GIVEN BY LUCHS	CORRECTED READING
xxii. 30, 1: <i>dicatoris ras. ex dicacatoris</i> <i>uel dictatoris</i> [ <i>dimicatoris R</i> ]	<i>dicatoris ras. ex dimicatoris</i>
xxiv. 7, 4: <i>dinomini P<sup>1</sup>, indimini P<sup>2</sup></i> <i>duae litterae ante m superscriptae nunc</i> <i>erasae sunt</i> [ <i>hiemini R<sup>1</sup>, indi hiemini manus pos-</i> <i>terior</i> ]	<i>dinomini P<sup>1</sup>, indimini P<sup>2</sup></i> <i>litterae hie ante m superscriptae nunc</i> <i>erasae sunt</i>

<sup>1</sup> Berl. Weidmann, 1888-89.

## READING OF P AS GIVEN BY LUCHS

xxvi. 25, 2: altergo *ras.* *ex* saltergo P<sup>1</sup>, alterno P<sup>2</sup>  
 [salterno R<sup>1</sup>, *inde ras.* alterno *effectum*]  
 xxvi. 30, 10: alere P<sup>1</sup>, priorem e delebit  
 et aio uel simile quid suprascriptis,  
 sed postea alere restituit P<sup>2</sup>  
 [alacre R]  
 xxvi. 31, 9: scio *ex* socio P<sup>1</sup>  
 [socio R]  
 xxvii. 30, 4: atheniensibus rhodiisque et  
 atheniensibus P<sup>1</sup>, ubi rhodiis erasum  
 est, et atheniensibus *del.* P<sup>2</sup>  
 [atheniensibus rhodiisque et R]  
 xxviii. 4, 2: captam P<sup>6</sup>, capiam P<sup>1</sup> *cum*  
*ras.* *super* priorem a (fuit fortasse ā)  
 [copiam R]  
 xxviii. 25, 11: mandonius *ras.* *ex* mando-  
 nius P<sup>1</sup>, at *inter* do a P<sup>2</sup> suprascripti-  
 tum rursus erasum  
 [mandato inius R]  
 xxix. 21, 11: habeant P<sup>6</sup>, abeant *ras.* *ex*  
 liabeant P<sup>1</sup>  
 [liabeant R]  
 xxix. 31, 11: mare P<sup>1</sup>, r *del.* P<sup>2</sup>, littera  
 quaedam suprascripta nunc erasa  
 [male R]

## CORRECTED READING

saltergo P<sup>1</sup>, salterno P<sup>2</sup>, *inde ras.* alterno  
*effectum*  
 alere P<sup>1</sup>, priorem e delebit et ac supra-  
 scriptis ut alacre efficeret P<sup>2</sup>, *sed postea*  
*ras.* alere *restitutum*  
 scio *ras.* *ex* socio P  
 atheniensibus rhodiisque et atheniensibus  
 P<sup>1</sup>, ubi et atheniensibus *del.* P<sup>2</sup>, *et postea*  
*rhodiis erasum est.* (This erasure is  
 later than the copying of R, and is  
 therefore not by P<sup>1</sup>)  
 captam P<sup>6</sup>, capiam P<sup>1</sup> *cum ras.* *super*  
*priorem a litterae o*  
 mandonius P<sup>1</sup>, mandatoinius P<sup>2</sup>, *inde*  
*ras.* mandonius *effectum*  
 liabeant P<sup>1</sup>, *inde ras.* abeant *effectum*,  
 habeant P<sup>6</sup>  
 mare P<sup>1</sup>, male P<sup>2</sup> (*qui r delebit et e sup-*  
*rascriptis*), *nunc ras.* mare *restitutum*

So far as I am aware, Luchs has not been led astray, in his choice between two readings, by ascribing undue authority to a correction by erasure, except in the following case. In xxv. 14, 11 he reads: *supra decem milia hostium occisa.* The traditional reading was *sex.* He cites his authority as follows: x *ras.* *ex ex* P *sex* ε. The reading in Vat. Reg. is: *ex in sex mutauit* R<sup>1</sup>. The erasure in P is therefore at least as late as the ninth century. Had it been made by the scribe of P, it would have carried some weight. As it is, its authority is not sufficient to outweigh the traditional reading of the late manuscripts, which has its source in the correction in Vat. Reg., especially as a parallel in favor of *sex* is found in xxv. 29, 10: *sex praefectos creauere.* The reading of P<sup>1</sup> was here *ex*, which is corrected to *sex* by P<sup>2</sup>. The context in this latter passage shows that the number was undoubtedly six, and *sex* is the reading of Luchs.

## 2. Other omissions and errata.

## READING OF P AS GIVEN BY LUCHS

xxii. 33, 8: creati P  
 39, 21: tuae  $\zeta$  uaetuae P  
 44, 2: aufidius P  
 45, 4: (no note in Luchs)  
 46, 5: antetalius P

46, 7: dextrore P  
 47, 4: est peditum est pugna P

50, 9: usmet P<sup>1</sup>, usmet P<sup>2</sup>

51, 3: setuosa P  
 52, 4: ducenta P<sup>2</sup>, ducenta milia  
 $\text{ex}$  ducentia milia P<sup>1</sup>  
 52, 5: sepelliendi  $\text{ex}$  sepelliendo  
 P<sup>1</sup>  
 (sepelliendi R<sup>1</sup>, sepelliendi  
 R<sup>2</sup>)  
 57, 10: uetera uel uestera P<sup>2</sup> uestpa  
 P<sup>1</sup>  
 60, 17: (no note in Luchs)  
 61, 7: ab hannibile P

xxiii. 4, 4: (no note in Luchs)  
 15, 5: (no note in Luchs)

xxiv. 4, 5: pueri P  
 11, 8: milamē. P<sup>1</sup> mila P<sup>2</sup>

xxvi. 25, 4: pelagoniam  $\text{ex}$  lagoniam  
 P<sup>1</sup>

xxvii. 44, 10: interpraeteseper P<sup>1</sup> inter-  
 praetes neper P<sup>2</sup>

xxviii. 6, 7: ab P<sup>2</sup> b P<sup>1</sup>

xxix. 25, 13: signu P<sup>1</sup> corr. P<sup>2</sup>

## CORRECTED READING

creatti P<sup>1</sup>, creati P<sup>2</sup>  
 fortuna uaetuae P<sup>1</sup> fortunae tuae P<sup>2</sup>  
 aufidius P<sup>1</sup>, aufidus P<sup>2</sup>  
 dies P<sup>1</sup>, die P<sup>2</sup>  
 antetalius P<sup>1</sup>, *littera c uel e super i scripta*  
*nunc erasa est, manus satis recens in*  
*ante talibus, ut uidetur, mutare conata*  
*est.*  
 dextrore P<sup>1</sup>, dextro P<sup>2</sup>  
 est peditum est pugna P<sup>1</sup>, est peditum  
 pugna P<sup>2</sup>  
 usmet P<sup>1</sup> usmet P<sup>2</sup>  
 (The correction is later than the copy-  
 ing of R)  
 setuosa P<sup>1</sup>, set uia P<sup>2</sup>  
 ducenti P<sup>2</sup>, ducenta milia  $\text{ex}$  ducentia  
 milia P<sup>1</sup>  
 sepelliendi  $\text{ex}$  sepelliendo P<sup>1</sup>, *qui i delevit*  
*et super o litteram i scripsit, post ras.*  
*sepelliendi effectum*  
 uetera uel uestera P<sup>2</sup>, uestpa P<sup>1</sup>

suntnistrictis P<sup>1</sup>, suntistrictis P<sup>2</sup>  
 (This should be omitted. Luchs has con-  
 fused the *ab* *hannibile* of xxii. 61, 8  
 with the *ad* *hannibalem* of this line.)

uitio ras.  $\text{ex}$  ultio P  
 nolam] notam P  
 pueri P<sup>1</sup>, pueru P<sup>2</sup>  
 miliamē. P<sup>1</sup> milia P<sup>2</sup>  
 pelagoniam  $\text{ex}$  laconiam P<sup>1</sup>

interpraeteseper P<sup>1</sup> interpraetesenper  
 P<sup>2</sup>  
 b P<sup>1</sup> a P<sup>2</sup>  
 sicnu|dato P<sup>1</sup>, sieno|dato P<sup>2</sup>

## PROPERTIUS AS PRAECEPTOR AMORIS

BY ARTHUR LESLIE WHEELER

In his effort to justify the *Ars amatoria* Ovid mentions both Tibullus and Propertius as predecessors who had given erotic teachings. In the case of Tibullus he gives proof by paraphrasing many lines of Tibullus i. 6 (cf. Ov. *Tr.* ii. 447-64); with regard to Propertius he contents himself (*ibid.*, 465) with the statement: "Invenies eadem blandi praecepta Properti." In spite of this perfectly definite testimony, a surprising difference of opinion has existed among scholars with regard to the position of Propertius in this important feature of Roman elegy—not indeed as to the truth of Ovid's words of the work of Propertius known to him, but as to the existence of such *praecepta* in the extant work of Propertius. Lachmann (ed. of Prop. [1816], *praefat.* p. xxi) went so far as to say, "Ubinam, quaeso, inveniemus, cum eiusmodi praecepta nulla hodie in Properti carminibus legantur?" As is well known, Lachmann believed that the *praecepta* alluded to by Ovid once formed part of Propertius' second book, but have been lost. This was one of the arguments by which the great scholar supported his famous "five-book" theory, which has created such confusion in references to Propertius. At the other extreme stands Plessis who, in combating the five-book theory (*Études sur Properce*, p. 99), answers Lachmann's question with the words, "Où? mais d'un bout à l'autre de son œuvre, qui est une œuvre d'amour; non, il est vrai, sous la forme didactique, mais de place en place et pénétrant le tout de leur esprit." In a note he refers to elegies i. 10, 21, ii. 16, 7-10, and possibly iv. 5 (whose genuineness, however, he suspects).

These two scholars represent extremes, and the truth as usual lies between. No one will today accept Lachmann's sweeping denial of all didactic element in Propertius, exaggerated as it was to support his five-book theory. Not even Birt, who takes in general the same position (*Rh. M.* XXXVIII [1883], 213 ff.), is able to deny altogether the presence of such an element, although he restricts

it as narrowly as he can. On the other hand, Plessis' reference to only three passages—one of which he regards as spurious—is obviously inadequate to support his assertion that erotic *praecepta* are found "d'un bout à l'autre de son œuvre." Rothstein usually recognizes in his notes the didactic tone wherever it appears, and says (*Anhang*, p. 344), "Nur zu dem Anstoss den Lachmann und andere an Ovids *invenies eadem blandi praecepta Properti . . . .* genommen haben, wird es nicht überflüssig sein darauf hinzuweisen, dass Properz selbst in den worten *ut per te clausas sciat excantare puellas qui volet austeros arte ferire viros* (iii. 3, 49) sich ausdrücklich als *furti praeceptor* hingestellt hat." This does not, of course, meet Lachmann's point,<sup>1</sup> and the position of Propertius as *praeceptor amoris*, together with the limits and nature of the erotodidactic element in his elegies, has by no means been determined. To this subject the present paper has been devoted in the conviction that a better understanding of the position of Propertius, the leading Roman elegist, in this important matter will lead to more reliable results than have hitherto been obtained concerning the relation of this and perhaps other elements of Roman elegy to the sources.

The rôle of *praeceptor amoris* (cf. Ovid *A.A.* i. 7-17; ii. 497 f.) is seen in its fullest development in Ovid's *Ars amatoria*. But the *Ars amatoria*, like so much else in the work of that facile poet, was only the expansion and development to more definite form of an element already present in Roman elegy. In Tibullus, as is well known, the erotodidactic element is prominent. Not only does he put into the mouth of Priapus (i. 4) a series of explicit *praecepta* for the conquest of boys, making that elegy a veritable *Ars amatoria* in embryo,<sup>2</sup> but also he assumes the rôle himself in i. 6; cf. i. 8 and i. 9. Propertius, as I hope to show, possesses the same features. Thus although the idea of composing a complete *Handbook of Love* was new,<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Lachmann did not deny the assumption of the rôle of *praeceptor* by Propertius, but asserted that the *praecepta* do not exist.

<sup>2</sup> "Ein wirklicher Abriss der Liebeskunst," Leo Plaut, *Forschungen*, p. 131. The expression "in embryo" seems to me to compare more clearly Tib. i. 4 and the *Ars amatoria*.

<sup>3</sup> It seems certain that Ovid would have mentioned any previous *Handbook of Love*, had there been one, in the well-known defense (*Tr. ii*). As Leo remarks (*Pl. F. ibid.*), "hätte er einen andern Verfasser einer *ars amatoria* nennen können, so wäre es sein Haupttrumpf gewesen; der Schluss *ex silentio* ist sicher."

the attitude assumed therein by the poet was already at hand in Tibullus and Propertius,<sup>1</sup> as he himself confesses (*Tr.* ii. 447 ff.). In addition, many of the details, the separate *praecepta*, had already appeared as such in the elegies of these two predecessors. Ovid gathered together in the *Ars amatoria* all sorts of erotic experiences and situations, whether from life or (more often) literature, and adapted them to the didactic point of view. The most convenient proof of this is at hand in the notes and appendix of P. Brandt's edition of the great *Handbook*. When, therefore, he assumes the rôle of *praeceptor* and instructs each sex how to make love successfully, both rôle and teachings are the results of abundant suggestions from his predecessors.

It is vital to our problem that in *Tr.* 447-65, where Ovid is defending himself for his own practice in the *Ars amatoria* and would therefore choose as convincing an example as possible, he does not choose *Tib.* i. 4,<sup>2</sup> a completely didactic elegy, but i. 6, only part of which is didactic. The conclusion is irresistible that Ovid regarded as *praecepta* not alone entire elegies written from the didactic point of view, but also all passages (parts of elegies) in which the poet assumes the rôle of erotic expert and instructor—the passages in which, if I may desecrate a term, he speaks *ex cathedra*. In our search, therefore, for erotic *praecepta* in Propertius, we are justified in selecting didactic passages wherever we find them. The passages which bear upon our problem fall into two groups: first, those in which Propertius makes clear that he considers himself a *praeceptor amoris* and his work not only a pleasure but an aid to lovers; second, those in which the teachings are contained—the explicit *praecepta*. The two groups naturally overlap, but are in general distinct.

The passages<sup>3</sup> in which Propertius claims to be *peritus* and therefore fitted to be an erotic instructor are chiefly included in those elegies in which he speaks of his work and its objects—the “pro-

<sup>1</sup> It is significant that he says nothing of Gallus in this connection.

<sup>2</sup> Leo (*Pl. F. ibid.*) thinks that Ovid did not choose i. 4, suggestive as it had been to him, because it dealt with the love of boys. We may add to this that i. 4 would not have afforded him so exact a parallel for his own practice, because i. 4 is vicariously didactic—Priapus is the teacher—whereas in i. 6 Tibullus himself is the teacher.

<sup>3</sup> References in this paper to Propertius follow the numbering of Rothstein's edition (1898). Ovid is cited according to Merkel-Ehwald, Teubner text (1902-5); Tibullus, according to Haupt-Vahlen (6th ed., 1904).

gramme poems," as Rothstein calls them. Rothstein himself cites, as we have seen (p. 29) iii. 3, 49, where Calliope, after warning him, vss. 41-46, to have nothing to do with martial themes, adds,

Quippe coronatos alienum ad limen amantes  
Nocturnaeque canes ebria signa fugae,  
Ut per te clausas sciat excantare pueras,  
Qui volet austeros arte ferire viros.

A chief object of his song, then, is to teach the lover how to secure the secluded fair; cf. *Tib.* i. 6, 9. Equally instructive is ii. 34. In 49 ff., the poet's friend Lynceus, the typical *rudis senex*, is addressed,

Nec tu tam duros per te patieris amores:  
Trux tamen a nobis ante domandus eris.

"I'll break you in to the ways of love," says the poet, "as an unruly bull is broken to the yoke;" cf. ii. 3, 49 f. He adds (55 ff.):

Aspice me, cui parva domi fortuna relicta est, . . . .  
Ut regnem mixtas inter conviva pueras  
Hoc ego quo tibi nunc elevor ingenio.

"Poor and lowly though I am, I am a veritable king in my power over women; and this poetic gift of mine [for erotic verse] is the secret." Finally (81, 82), after the well-known compliment to Vergil, he concludes,

Non tamen haec [erotic elegy] ulli venient ingrata legenti,  
Sive in amore rudis sive peritus erit.

"Lovers both experienced and inexperienced will enjoy my verse." Propertius himself is, of course, *peritus*; cf. ii. 32, 19 f.:

Nil agis, insidias in me componis inanes,  
Tendis iners docto retia nota mihi

(i. 9, 7): Me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum (cf. ii. 34, 3).

i. 7 and i. 9 are companion pieces to the epic poet Ponticus. In i. 7 Ponticus, as yet heart whole, is represented as rather supercilious toward the poor poet who is vainly trying to appease a cruel mistress (5, 6):

Nos, ut consuemus, nostros agitamus amores  
Atque aliquid duram quaerimus in dominam, . . . .  
["gemeint sind Verse, mit denen er sie erobern will."—Rothstein];

9 ff:

. . . . haec mea fama est,  
 Hinc cupio nomen carminis ire mei.  
 Me laudent doctae solum placuisse puellae. . . .  
 Me legat assidue post haec neglectus amator,  
 Et prosint illi cognita nostra mala.

“Der Dichter denkt sich als zukünftigen Lehrer der Liebe,” as Rothstein says, and just before, “wie die Liebesdichtung der Fiktion nach dem Dichter zu einem Erfolg in seiner Liebe verhelfen soll, so soll sie nach der Auffassung der römischen Erotiker auch auf andere belehrend wirken; vgl. i. 1, 37; 10, 15; 15b, 41.” We may add *Tib.* ii. 5, 113; *Lygdamus*, 4, 43; *Ovid A. A.* iii. 534 ff., etc., to these references and remark that the “fiction” that verses aid in the prosecution of love prevails chiefly in theoretical passages like ii. 34, 55 ff.; practically the poets find them of little avail and often bemoan the sad fact; cf. p. 35 and n. 1. But to return to Ponticus—there is a hint (21 f.) that he may need such aid as Propertius can give him, and in i. 9 the prophecy comes true: Ponticus is a victim of love. The poet begins with an “I told you so,” and proceeds to descant (5 ff.) on his own expertness.

Non me Chaoniae vincta in amore columbae  
 Dicere, quos iuvenes quaeque puella domet.  
 Me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum:  
 Atque utinam posito dicar amore rudis!

Bitter experience has made him an expert,<sup>1</sup> and erotic verse helps. (11 f.),

Plus in amore valet Mimmeri versus Homero:  
 Carmina mansuetus lenia quaerit Amor.

The lesson to be derived from his own case is enforced by iii. 11, 1-8, ending

Ista ego praeterita iactari verba iuventa:  
 Tu nunc exemplo disce timere meo.

But it is unnecessary to cite more evidence<sup>2</sup> that Propertius regarded himself as an erotic expert whose example and verse would

<sup>1</sup> *Peritus* and *rudis* (*imperitus* is impossible in dactylic verse) are of course erotic technical terms.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also, iii. 1, 39-40; iii. 2, 7; iii. 9, 43-46; i. 10, 13-20.

prove helpful to other lovers. This belief was indeed of the very essence of his whole calling as a poet, as is clear from the fact that it is expressed so often in those very poems in which he discusses the nature and objects of his own poetic work in contrast with that of others. Naturally most of these passages are general and theoretical, and contain none of the explicit *praecepta* the existence of which, in our extant *corpus Propertianum*, was all too hastily denied by Lachmann. To the latter we now turn, reserving more extended comment on both groups until the facts have been placed before us.

The difficulty at once arises of drawing the line between those passages which are openly didactic and those which are such only by implication. If we followed the general statements of Propertius that his own experiences should be instructive to all lovers who can profit by them, we should have a very large mass of material under discussion. This is, indeed, the method of Ovid, who adapts in the *Ars amatoria* any and every erotic experience to his own didactic purposes. But to be on the safe side, it will serve our purpose to include only those passages which are more or less openly didactic—"more or less," because Propertius was not, like Ovid, writing an erotic handbook, and it would have been inartistic for him openly to point the teaching in every case, even when he wished it to be taken by his readers as such.<sup>1</sup> The true reflection of this method is not found in the *Ars amatoria*, but in the *Amores*, many of whose more or less covert teachings Ovid uses over again in the *Ars*, just as he uses the suggestions drawn from Tibullus and Propertius, to mention no others. The passages follow accompanied by the briefest comment.

In i. 10 and i. 20 Propertius addresses his friend Gallus. After a general statement of his skill in matters erotic (i. 10, 13-20), he proceeds (21-30) to give some explicit instruction to Gallus for immediate use:

<sup>1</sup>In addition to frequent assertions on the part of Propertius of the generally instructive nature of his work, there is at least one concrete case in which he himself indicates the instruction which his readers will infer from an elegy not outspokenly and formally didactic. In ii. 23 he deals with the old theme (cf. Horace *Sat.* i. 2), *scorta* vs. *matronae*, professing (insincerely) to give his own views without seeking to instruct anybody. He is aware, however, that his readers may take these views as instruction, for the first four lines of ii. 24 contain an objection to them by a reader who points out their inconsistency with the poet's practice.

Tu cave ne tristi cupias pugnare puellae,  
 Neve superba loqui, neve tacere diu:  
 Neu, si quid petuit, ingrata fronte negaris,  
 Neu tibi pro vano verba benigna cadant.  
 Irritata venit quando contemnitur illa,  
 Nec meminit iustas ponere laesa minas.  
 At quo sis humilis magis et subiectus Amori,  
 Hoc magis effectu saepe fruare bono.  
 Is poterit felix una remanere puella,  
 Qui numquam vacuo pectore liber erit.

Here are certainly as many explicit teachings—mostly of the “don’t” type—as Gallus could well take in at one sitting. And the pedagogical principle that the teacher should heed the character of his pupil is well observed, for we have only to read i. 13 and i. 20 to learn what manner of man this Gallus was; cf. Rothstein on i. 10, 29.

The advice contained in i. 20 is brief and is confined to the first fifteen verses and the last two of the elegy. Stripped of its poetic adornment it is: Guard your favorite boy from the greedy nymphs lest you suffer, Gallus, as did Hercules from whom Hylas was stolen. The story of Hylas follows in epic style, and the last two verses revert to the beginning, applying the moral of the tale to the case of Gallus and his *παιδίς*:

His, o Galle, tuos monitus servabis amores,  
 Formosum nymphis credere visus Hylan.

The danger to Gallus cannot be real, unless some human *puellae* be concealed under the title of the nymphs (cf. Tibullus-Marathus-Pholoe in *Tib.* i. 8), but seems introduced merely to give an elegiac setting to the story of Hylas, which Propertius may have drawn from some Alexandrian epyll (cf. Rothstein, headnote) or narrative mythological elegy. At least, the erotic precept is clear, whatever its motive. Its basis is not, as usual, the poet’s own experience, but myth.

ii. 34, a poem which passes from the particular to the general, contains much, as we have seen (p. 31), on the poet’s position as erotic expert. It also includes erotic advice to the poet’s friend Lynceus, from whose tipsy faithlessness the elegy takes its start. This inadvertence on the part of Lynceus causes the poet to give

expression to the *sententia* that, where love is concerned, friends and relatives prove faithless (3 ff.):

Expertus dico, nemo est in amore fidelis:  
Formosam raro non sibi quisque petit,  
Polluit ille deus cognatos, solvit amicos, etc.

The precept is contained in the first verse:

Cur quisquam faciem dominae iam credat amico?

But this is for lovers in general. For Lynceus himself, whose act has shown that he is not too old to be a lover, the poet has advice which, as in the case of Gallus (i. 10), is suited to the character of his pupil. Lynceus is a poet, mayhap a philosopher (27 ff.), whose literary pursuits are not of the type likely to aid him in advancing his interests as a lover. Hence he is counseled to turn to erotic models (31 f.):

Tu satius memorem musis imitere Philetam  
Et non inflati somnia Callimachi.

41 ff.: Desine et Aeschyleo componere verba cothurno,  
Desine, et ad molles [erotic] membra resolve choros. . . .  
Tu non Antimacho, non tution ibis Homero:  
Despici et magnos recta puella deos.

Propertius continues in what follows to offer his own aid (see p. 31). The advice to Lynceus, then, is rather an application to a concrete case of the theory that erotic poetry and composition in general aid the lover because of their influence on the sex<sup>1</sup> than any explicit and practical precepts.

ii. 4, to which Vahlen and Rothstein prefix ii. 3, 45-54, is didactic throughout,<sup>2</sup> the first four verses more obviously so because of their form:

<sup>1</sup>This principle is by no means always effective in the poet's own case, but it is part of his creed and is frequently asserted; cf. i. 8b, 40; ii. 13, 7; ii. 26b, 25 f.; iii. 1, 40; iii. 2, 1 ff., etc. We must beware, of course, of taking the references to Philetas and Callimachus (ii. 34, 31-32) as implying an erotodidactic element in their work; rather the allusion is to the *general* value of all erotic poetry to the lover. I shall recur to this point elsewhere.

<sup>2</sup>This is the only erotodidactic elegy according to Birt *Rh. M.* XXXVIII (1883), 213 ff. Birt's theory (after Lachmann) that the *praecepta* alluded to by Ovid have been lost, makes it necessary for him to find as few traces as possible in the extant *corpus Propertianum*, and he is greatly aided in this by defining the *praecepta* as entire elegies—against the clear testimony of Ovid, as I have pointed out.

Multa prius dominae delicta queraris oportet,  
 Saepe roges aliquid, saepe repulsus eas,  
 Et saepe immeritos corrumpas dentibus unguis,  
 Et crepitum dubio suscitet ira pede.

But the rest of the elegy, though not formally (like these lines) addressed to a second person, nevertheless recounts erotic experiences and inferences which the poet has found true in his own hopeless case and transmits to others for their benefit. The second person (*queraris*, *roges*, etc.) is an indefinite address and includes any lover. The hopeless situation of the poet is like that depicted in i. 1, and the incurable nature of his passion is epigrammatically expressed, with abundant illustration, in ii. 1, 58: "Solanus amor morbi non amat artificem."

In ii. 14 Propertius announces his "discovery" from experience of the way to "fetch her": be indifferent to her! This is addressed as a precept to lovers in general (19 ff.):

Hoc sensi prodesse magis: contemnite, amantes:  
 Sic hodie veniet, si qua negarit heri.

As Rothstein (on 19) says, "Aus dieser Erfahrung sollen auch andere Liebende Nutzen ziehen; das entspricht der lehrhaften Neigung der römischen Erotik."

ii. 18 (to which Rothstein prefixes ii. 17) begins with the precept: Be complaisant, for a display of jealousy begets dislike:

Assiduae multis odium peperere querelae:  
 Frangitur in tacito femina saepe viro.  
 Si quid vidisti,<sup>1</sup> semper vidisse negato:  
 Aut si quid doluit forte, dolere nega.

"Die Beobachtung," says Rothstein (*ad loc.*). "die der Dichter macht, verwendet er, der lehrhaften Neigung der antiken Erotik folgend, sofort zur Belehrung anderer." To this principle—complaisance and subjection—together with his avowal of undying devotion to her alone (ii. 17, 17-18), the poet looks for safety in the future, and others also may profit by it.

<sup>1</sup>The avowal to the *amica*, probably Cynthia, ii. 20, 13:

De te quodcumque ad surdas mihi dicitur aures,  
 affords a fair illustration of the poet's own practice of this principle.

ii. 25, 29-34 offer to a rival the advice: Don't show your love too openly; keep mum; don't be too eager; cf. *Tib.* iv. 13, 8:

Qui sapit, in tacito gaudeat ille sinu.

But the advice, good though it may be on occasion, is here obviously insincere and given in the interest of the poet; cf. Rothstein's notes. The estranged *puella* will easily perceive from the poem the poet's undying fidelity and the fickle character of his rival. The result will be a return to the old love.<sup>1</sup>

It is a striking proof of the importance of the didactic element that i. 1—an elegy which was designed to serve as introduction to one book, if not more, of the collection—contains unmistakable traces of it. After depicting his utter subjection to the power of love (his prevalent condition) and tracing the cause of Cynthia's obduracy to his own temporary faithlessness, he holds himself up as a warning to others with the advice (35 ff.):

Hoc, moneo, vitate malum: sua quemque moretur  
Cura, neque assueto mutet amore locum.  
Quod si quis monitis tardas adverterit aures,  
Heu referet quanto verba dolore mea!

Cf. Rothstein, headnote, "und mit einer Warnung . . . schliesst das Gedicht (31-38), wie auch sonst die römischen Liebesdichter sich gern als Warner und Berater unerfaherner junger Leute denken," and he adds that the manner reminds of Tibullus. It is noteworthy that in his hopeless condition nothing aids him—not even the patient submission which he himself preaches (ii. 18; ii. 17; i. 17, etc.) and of which Milanion is the type both here and in Ovid *A.A.* ii. 187 ff.—for at present (17, 18):

. . . amor non ullas cogitat artes,  
Nec meminit notas, ut prius, ire vias.

As a lover Propertius naturally takes sides against the precepts by which woman learns to conquer man. Unlike Ovid, who in the third book of the *Arts amatoria* professes to put arms in the hands of the Amazons, Propertius either advises the sex for his own interest (i. 2; cf. ii. 18b) or is outspoken in his bitterness against the whole

<sup>1</sup> Both ii. 18, 1-4 and ii. 25, 29-34 are cited by Birt *loc. cit.*, as didactic, but too short to count.

feminine system (iv. 5; iii. 13, etc.). It is sufficient in this connection to remark that in i. 2, which ostensibly preaches to Cynthia the doctrine that "beauty unadorned" is power enough for her, he gives clear hints (23 and 26) that his advice to discard all the adventitious aids to beauty is prompted not so much by any conviction on the subject of masculine taste as by jealous fears of Cynthia's purpose in seeking such adornment. In the same way the bit of advice for girls in general, derived from the faithlessness of one of Cynthia's lovers<sup>1</sup> (ii. 21, 15 f.),

Ah nimium faciles aurem praebere puellae!  
Discite desertae non temere esse bona—

is really an "I told you so" in his own interest. The same selfish motive is obvious in his advice to Cynthia (ii. 16, 7-12) to "pluck the praetor and send him off."<sup>2</sup>

It seems, therefore, that Ovid's words—

Invenies eadem blandi praecepta Properti—

have been found strictly true, even of the extant *corpus Propertianum*. Other didactic elegies may have been lost, as Lachmann thought, but we do not need to assume such loss to justify Ovid. Propertius thus takes his place side by side with Tibullus and Ovid as erotic expert. In all three poets love appears as an *ars* (*τέχνη*) of which the poet-lover is master.<sup>3</sup> This part of our investigation will be

<sup>1</sup> Is the Panthus of this elegy the same as the lover and rival of ii. 25? The fickleness of both might serve to identify them.

<sup>2</sup> This passage serves to introduce the mention of iv. 5, in which the poet displays his knowledge of the whole system of avaricious teaching by which the *amicae* plundered and cajoled the poor lover. The advice to Cynthia (ii. 16, 7 ff.) is a mere use for his own purposes of that given by the *lena*, iv. 5, 20-60, especially 48 ff.—

Nec tibi dispiceat miles non factus amori, etc.

The elegy (iv. 5) is filled with *praecepta*—none more so—but they are not the poet's and he curses their author. It is, as Rothstein (headnote) says, "eine *ars amandi* im kleinen für das weibliche Geschlecht," and it will become important to us later.

<sup>3</sup> The passages already cited by no means exhaust the subject. I add here without comment a number of passages, some of which are more or less outspokenly didactic and all of which are connected with the treatment of love as a *τέχνη*: the preachments against the avarice of *amicae* (iii. 13; cf. iv. 5 and ii. 24); the principle that one cannot flee from love (ii. 30) and its opposite—the journey to cure love (iii. 21; cf. i. 12, 11 and Ovid *R. A.* 213 ff.); the anger of the *amica* implies love (iii. 8; cf. i. 12, 15-16 and Catullus Ixxii and xcii); the hunt (ii. 19, 17 ff.); love's compact (iii. 20, 15 ff.; cf. iv. 8, 71 ff.); the corrupting influence of pictures (ii. 6, 26 ff.); love and wine (iii. 17; cf. Ovid *R. A.* 805-10, and—a different aspect—ii. 33, 27 ff.); the nature and attributes of love (i. 5; ii. 12; ii. 26b; ii. 15, etc.). A long list of erotic *sententiae* might be added. I shall have occasion to consider these passages in another place.

suitably concluded with some observations on the general aspects of erotic teaching in Propertius.

We have seen that Propertius attributes his rôle as *praeceptor amoris* to his inspiration as a poet (pp. 31-3). On the other hand he professes to draw his actual knowledge of love and the principles by which it may be successfully prosecuted from his own experience. It is but another way of saying this when he uses such expressions as "Cynthia me docuit . . . non nihil egit Amor" (i. 10, 19 f.), "Amor . . . Donec docuit" (i. 1, 5), "Imbuit . . . Lycinna" (iii. 15, 6). Cynthia is even exalted to the position of his whole inspiration (ii. 1, 3 f.: "Non haec Calliope, non haec mihi cantat Apollo:<sup>1</sup> Ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit"), but we must make allowances for the lover; the poet speaks in iii. 3, 38, Calliopea, etc. Occasionally the experiences of others afford the basis of some erotic principle, as in i. 20, the story of Hylas; but in general, "Me dolor et lacrimae merito fecere peritum" (i. 9, 7) represents the type of his professed training.

The pupils to whom the poet-teacher addresses his instruction are either concrete and individual—Ponticus (i. 7; i. 9), Gallus (i. 10; i. 20, etc.), Lynceus (ii. 34), Cynthia (i. 2; ii. 186) etc., or unnamed and general. In the latter case the address varies from a more definite *amantes* (i. 15b, 41; ii. 14, 19), *puellae* (ii. 21, 15), *tu* (ii. 25, 21), *vos* (ii. 4, 1 ff., etc.) to a second person merely implied in the form of the verb (ii. 4, 1 ff.; ii. 18, 3 f.; i. 1, 35, etc.). In all cases, however, the persons addressed, whether definite or indefinite, are lovers actual or prospective—the class to which he feels called upon to speak.

The stress which Propertius lays upon his own experience as the source of his erotic knowledge must not, of course, be taken too literally. It is certain that not Ovid alone, but Tibullus and Propertius also, though perhaps in less degree, derived much of their erotic knowledge from literature. Even if Propertius actually had most of the experiences from which he deduces his principles, he

<sup>1</sup>Ovid, with characteristic audacity, professes to receive not only inspiration but actual teaching from Apollo (*A. A.* ii. 493 ff.) and Venus (*ibid.* iii. 48). Tibullus selects a more humble divine instructor, and one well adapted to his purpose, in the figure of Priapus (i. 4); cf. i. 8. 5: "Venus . . . perdocuit," but this is used, like the passages in Propertius, to denote experience.

would not have made all the deductions in their present form, if he had not had predecessors to point the way. The effect upon the reader is equally realistic whether the poet has actually lived over again or merely professes to have lived over again the world-old experiences which he found already recorded in literature. It is in fact this very profession of experience, often merely an artistic expedient, which connects the erotodidactic element with the personal, rendering it part and parcel of that subjective-erotic note, which is the chief characteristic of Roman elegy. When to this fact is added its oneness with the very inspiration of the poet, the erotodidactic becomes such an essential feature of Roman elegy that, if light can be thrown upon its sources and the channel by which those sources influenced Tibullus, Propertius, and Ovid, much will have been done to advance our knowledge of the vexed problem of the sources of Roman elegy in general. As a preliminary to this wider view it has seemed to me necessary to determine the status of the problem within the work of Propertius, who possesses the advantage of antedating Ovid in this element of elegiac art and of being much more full and frank in utterances that may throw light on the sources than his contemporary Tibullus. I have therefore dispensed with a multitude of parallels that might have been cited from his two colleagues because such parallels must necessarily be considered in any effort to push the investigation back to the sources —an effort which I must reserve for another paper.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

## ODYSSEAN WORDS FOUND IN BUT ONE BOOK OF THE *ILIAD*

BY JOHN A. SCOTT

The theory advanced by Geddes in his *Problem of the Homeric Poems* is that the books of Homer are to be divided into two groups, the Achillean and the Odyssean; the Achilleid is the work of one age or poet, the non-Achillean books of the *Iliad* and the entire *Odyssey* the work of another. Geddes supported this theory by showing that the non-Achillean books of the *Iliad*, and the *Odyssey* have many common peculiarities of customs and vocabulary. This argument as applied to all the non-Achillean portions of the *Iliad* has met with little favor, yet certain books, especially the tenth, are supposed to have marked connections with the *Odyssey*; cf. Wilamowitz *Homerische Untersuchungen*, p. 231; Robert *Studien zur Ilias*, p. 501; Cauer *Grundfragen*, p. 524. The argument most used to prove this connection is that certain words found in the *Doloneia* appear in the *Odyssey*, but in no other book of the *Iliad*. A list of such words is given by Duentzer *Philologus* XII (1857), 57 ff. (reprinted, *Homerische Abhandlungen*, pp. 303 ff.); Gemoll *Hermes* XV (1880) 557; Leaf, Introduction to Kappa in his edition of the *Iliad*; also Monro in his Introduction to Kappa. Cf. also, Ranke *Die Doloneia*, Goslar, 1881. Nearly everyone who has discussed the tenth book in recent years has emphasized this point. The argument from similarity of vocabulary is generally deemed most cogent and has not been seriously questioned. The purpose of this paper is to extend to each book of the *Iliad* the investigation which has been given to Kappa, and also in a less degree to Iota, Psi, and Omega. Thus it will be seen whether the connection in vocabulary between these books and the *Odyssey* is peculiar, or is shared in by other books of the *Iliad*. The results have been obtained by the aid of Gehring's *Index Homericus*, Ebeling's *Lexicon Homericum*, Capelle's *Woerterbuch des Homeros*, as well

as by repeated reading of the poems themselves. Under each book a list of words found in that book only in the *Iliad* and in the *Odyssey* will be given, and also a list of words of frequent occurrence in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to that single book. Numerals have not been counted, the comparative and superlative of adjectives and adverbs are not distinguished from the positive, such kindred forms as ἄργυρος, ἄργυρος are counted as one, and the simple verb, in general, is not distinguished from the compound. The text is that of Ludwich.

A. ἀδάκρυτος, ἀθερίζω, ἀπριάτην, ἀταρτηρός, ἄτιμος, γέλως, δικαστόλος, ἐπιτηδές, ἐρετμόν, ἡχήεις, -θηλέω (simple or compound), ἵκμενος, κερτόμια(τά), Κλυταιμνήστρη, κώπη, λαμπετάω, ὁμοιώ, ὁρεσκῶδης, ὄρμος (anchorage), παλιμπλάζομαι, πεμπώβολον, πολυβενθής, πρότονος, πρυμνήσια, στέιρα, ὑβρις—26. Of these words γέλως is found in the *Odyssey* seven times, ὑβρις fifteen, the second word appearing in A twice. Words frequent in the *Odyssey* which are rare in the *Iliad* but not restricted to this book are: ἥπειρος found also in B, ἡριγένεια ΘΩ, ἵστιον Ο, νημερτής ΓΖΞ.

B. Ἀθῆναι, ἀκράαντος, ἀκριτόμυθος, ἀμέγαρτος, ἀνιάδω, ἄννυσις, ἀπορρώξ, ἀριθμέω, ἀχρέιον, Γόρτυς, δεκάς, Δουλίχιον, είνοσιφυλλος, ἐπαιγίζω, ἔξαιρετος, ἐπιδέξια, ἐναρθμίος, ἐνύπνιον, Ἐρεχθεύς, Εὔβοια, Εύρυτος, ἐφέστιος, Ζάκυνθος, Θαλάσσιος, Θυέστης, θύρετρα, Ἰαωλκός, Ἰθάκη, Ἰθακήσιος, κενέος, κητώεις, μεθήμων, μιλτοπάργος, Νήριτον, οἰνοχόος, Οἰχαλιεύς, ὄστρα, Πελίνης, πέταλον, πολυσπερής, ρώγαλέος, σέλινον, σκόπελος, Τπερηστή, ὑπόστχεσις, Φαιστός, Φεραί, Φιλοκτήτης—48. Of these words ἀνιάδω is found in the *Odyssey* six times, ἀριθμέω five. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἄγγεα Π, αἰπόλια Λ, αἰπόλος Δ, ἀοιδή Ω, ἔτος ΛΩ, λειμών Π, νόστος ΙΚΠ. The Catalogue of the Ships necessarily contains many proper names found elsewhere in Homer only in the *Odyssey*; if these words are omitted from the list, the Odyssean words in this book are only slightly more numerous than in A.

Γ. -άγχω, ἄιδρις, ἄλείτης, ἄσκος, γρηνής, δούλη, ἐπιτροχάδην, εὐώδης, ἔχθος, θέσκελος, Κάστωρ, κίθαρις, κραναός, -μετρέω, ξεινοδόκος, πηός, Πολυδεύκης, πολύμυθος, πορσαίνω, τετραχθά, τέχνη, -τήκω,

-τοξάζομαι, -ευνάζομαι—24. Of these words *γρηγός* is found in the *Odyssey* twenty-two times, -ευνάζομαι seven, *τέχνη* seven, -τήκω nine, -τοξάζομαι seven. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀθέσφατος Κ, *νημερτής* ΑΖΞ, *ξεινίζω* Ζ.

Δ. ἄγαλμα, *αἴγειρος*, *άκουνάζομαι*, *άμελγω*, *άτελεστος*, -βρίζω, *γλυφίς*, *δάπεδον*, *δῆνος*, *δνοπαλίζω*, *ἐπτάπυλος*, *κορώνη*, *κουρότερος*, *κυκλοτερής*, *μεταμώνια*, *δόπταλέος*, *περιώσιον*, *πολυνηχής*, *φίλως*, *φθονέω* (twice)—20. Of these words *ἄγαλμα* is found in the *Odyssey* seven times, *αἴγειρος* seven, *δάπεδον* nine, *μεταμώνια* five, *φθονέω* eight. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: *αἰπόλος* Β, *άτασθαλίη* Χ, *βάζω* ΙΞΠ, *ἐλέφας* Ε, *οἰστεύω* ΔΘ, *ταλασίφρων* Λ, *ὑπερηνορέων* Ν.

Ε. *ἀκροπόλος*, *Ἀλωένις*, *ἀμενηνός*, *ἀτρεκής*, *Γοργείη*, *εἰροπόκος*, *εἴρω* (ἐερμένος), *ἐμμαπέως*, *Ἐφιάλτης*, *ῆκω*, *θρασυμέμνων*, *κεκαφηότα*, *-λευκαίνω*, *μαψιδίως*, *μικρός*, *μινυρίζω*, *νηνεμήη*, *ξέω*, *περίφρων*, *περόνη*, *πολύθουλος*, *πόρτις*, *φθόγγος*—23. Especially to be noted is the fact that *περίφρων* found in the *Odyssey* more than fifty times occurs in the *Iliad* in this book only. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: *ἄγρος* Ψ, *ἀλλότριος* Τ, *εἶδαρ* Ν, *εἴδωλον* Ψ, *ἐλέφας* Δ, *εὐεργήης* ΝΙΩ, *ηεροειδής* Ψ, *θέσφατος* Θ.

Ζ. *ἀγαπητός*, *ἀεκαζόμενος*, *ἀλίγκιος*, *ἀμβατός*, *δούλιος*, *ἔαρ*, *ἐπουράνιος*, *εύπατέρεια*, *εύρρείτης*, *ἡλακάτη*, *θυμοφθόρος*, *Λαοδάμεια*, *μανθάνω*, *παμποίκιλος*, *πενθερός*, *πίναξ*, *ποίκιλμα*, *πομπή*, *Σιδόνιος*, *Σίσυφος*, *Σόλυμοι*, *ὑπότροπος*, *χρυσήνιος*—23. Of these words *πομπή* occurs in the *Odyssey* twenty-five times. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: *ἀλάομαι* ΚΘΨ, *ἀληθής* Μ, *νημερτής* ΑΓΞ, *ξεινίζω* Γ, *ταμίη* Ω, *φυτεύω* Ο.

Η. *ἀκαλαρρείτης*, *ἀφροσύνη*, *γεραίρω*, *ζατρεφής*, *κριτός*, *μειλίσσω*, *μήκιστος*, *νῆις*, *-νηνέω*, *δρύσσω*, *πιυστή(ή)*, *πολυτλήμων*, *φειδώ*, *χωρίς*—14. Of these words *χωρίς* is used in the *Odyssey* six times; *μέθυ* used sixteen times in the *Odyssey* is found in the *Iliad* in but two books, Η and Ι.

Θ. *βέρεθρον*, *ἐπιστεφής*, *έύθρονος*, *εύκλείη*, *ἡπεδανός*, *θηλύτεραι*, *θῶκος*, *κάπη*, *κομέω* (twice), *μίγδα*, *οἴκοθι*, *πάντως*, *πρωθήβης*—13.

Of these ἔύθρονος is found in the *Odyssey* five times, θηλύτεραι six, κομέω seven. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀλάομαι ΖΚΨ, ἡρυγένεια ΑΩ, θέσφατος Ε, μηχανάω Λ, οἰστεύω Δ.

I. ἀεργός, ἀθέμιστος, Αἰγύπτιος, ἄκος, ἀπηλεγέως, ἄροσις, ἀρτίπος, ἀνλις, ἀνπνος, ἀφραδέω, βαθύζωνος, δωτίνη, ἐλέγχω, ἐλέος, ἐπαινός, ἐπίζαφελώς, ἐπώνυμος, ἐρανός, ἐρκίον, εὐερκής, ἐχέφρων, ἡμάτιος, ἥρι, θαλίη, τεθηλώς, θυμαρής, καλλίκομος, κλητοί, κτάομαι, κῶας, μάσταξ, μῆλον (a fruit), ὀμῆλιξ, ὀππόθι, οὐθαρ, παλλακίς, Περεφόνεια, πηλός, πολυπενθής, πρηκτήρ, ψιλός—41. Of these ἐχέφρων is found in the *Odyssey* eight times. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: βάζω ΔΞΠ, ἐρυθρός Τ, κάνεον ΛΩ, μέθυ Η, μενοεικής Ψ, νόστος ΒΚΠ, ποθέν Σ, ρήγος Ω. Many scholars have called attention to the Odyssean element in the vocabulary of I; cf. Leaf and Monro, each in his Introduction to I in their respective editions of the *Iliad*: yet when similarity of theme and incident is considered, the agreement is no more than that of the other books. The preparations for the meal and for retiring for the night, as well as the presence of Odysseus, correspond with scenes in the *Odyssey*, and call for a like vocabulary.

K. ἀδέω (ἀδηκότες), ἀκτίς, ἀσάμινθος, ἀσπάζομαι, Αὐτόλυκος, ἀωτέω, δαίτη, δόξα, δόσις, ἐσχάρη, κερδαλέος, μεγαλίζομαι, νιφετός, ὄρφναή, προφερέστερος, τολμήεις, φῆμις—17. To these might be added the variant δαί and the false formation τοίσδεσσι. Of the words in this list ἀσάμινθος is found in the *Odyssey* ten times, ἐσχάρη ten, φῆμις six. Words common in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀλάομαι ΖΘΨ, κέρδος Ψ, ἀπονίπτω ΠΩ, νόστος ΒΙΠ, νς Ψ. Few books in the *Iliad* have so small a number of Odyssean words as the *Doloneia*, and this is the more remarkable from the fact that Odysseus is one of its leading characters.

Λ. ἀορτήρ, ἀστός, βόλομαι (βούλομαι), γυνήσιος, δαιτρεύω, δαρδάπτω, διδημι, δρυμός, ἔνδιος, ἥλιθα, ἥωθι, ἰοειδής, κακόω, κριθαί, κρόμυον, κύανος, κυκεών, Κύπρος, λύγος, μουνόω, ποικιλομήτης, πολύπλαγκτος, Πράμνειος, ρόπαλον, σκιερός, τεῖν (σοί), συβόσιον, ταρσός, τυρός, ίβριζω, φαέθων, χρηζίζω, ὠδίνω—33. Words fre-

quent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀγελαῖος Ψ, ἀέκητι ΜΟ, αἰπόλιον Β, ἄλειστον Ω, ἀτάσθαλος ΝΧ, ἔτος ΒΩ, κάνεον ΙΩ, μηχανάω Θ, νομεύς ΟΡΣ, ταλασίφρων Δ. It will be observed that this book has more Odyssean words than the *Doloneia*.

M. *βοάγριον*, *βάθορες*, *δικλίς*, *ἔξαιτος*, *ἐπημοιβός*, *ἐπηρεφής*, *ζαής*, *Δαπιθαι*, *πέλωρος*, *συνεχές*, *τρίαινα*, *ῦω*—12. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀέκητι ΛΟ, ἀληθής Ζ, *ῥάβδος* Ω.

N. *αἰνίζομαι*, *βοτάνη*, *βονγάλε*, *ἔλαινος*, *ἐπίουρος*, *ἢμα*, *θωή*, *καρφαλέος*, *όρχηθμός*, *πέδονδε*, *περιμήκης*, *-πτύσσομαι*, *ὑβριστής*, *ὑψιπέτηλος*, *φθιστιμβροτος*, *χθαμαλός*, *ῳλξ* (ῳλκα)—17. Of these words *ἢμα* is found in the *Odyssey* six times, *περιμήκης* seven, *-πτύσσομαι* ten. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀτάσθαλος ΛΧ, *βουκόλος* ΟΨ, *εὐεργής* ΕΠΩ, *εὐστρεφής* Ο, *ὑπερηνορέων* Δ, *ὑπερφιάλως* Σ.

Ξ. *ἀάστος*, *ἀγκονή*, *ἀεικέλιος*, *ἀιστος*, *ἄνασσα*, *-δαρθάνω*, *εἰλαπινάζω*, *ἔρματα* (ear ornaments), *θελκτήριον*, *ἰμείρω*, *κυμαίνω*, *κῶμα*, *λικριφίς*, *μετέπειτα*, *μορόεις*, *όδμή*, *όρμίζω*, *ὄρχατος*, *πέλαγος*, *περιμήκετος*, *Πιερίη*, *-πλέκω*, *ποίη*, *Ραδάμανθυς*, *σιγάω*, *σκήπτω*, *τραφερός*, *τρίγληνος*—28. Of these *-δαρθάνω* is found in the *Odyssey* eight times, *ἰμείρω*, *κυμαίνω*, *όδμή*, *ὄρχατος* five each, *πέλαγος* six. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: *βάζο* ΔΙΠ *νημερτής* ΑΓΖ.

O. *ἀθυρμα*, *ἀκούτης*, *ἀπινύσσω*, *ἀποσταδόν*, *ἀσφαλής*, *δάσκιος*, *δεικανάομαι*, *ἔξαιτος*, *εύρύπορος*, *ἡλεός*, *ἴκρια*, *ἰοδόκος*, *κακορραφίη*, *Κυλλήνιος*, *λόγος*, *νωίτερος*, *όλιγηπτελέω*, *παρασταδόν*, *στάθμη*, *στρεύγομαι*, *τετραθέλυμνος*, *ὑποθημοσύνη*, *ῳκύαλος*—23. Of these *ἴκρια* is found in the *Odyssey* seven times, *στάθμη* five. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: *ἀέκητι* ΑΜ, *βουκόλος* ΝΨ, *εὐστρεφής* Ν, *θαμά* Π, *ιστίον* Α, *νομεύς* ΛΡΣ, *φυτεύω* Ζ, *κυανόπτρωρος* Ψ.

Π. *ἀγκυλοχείλης*, *ἀκάκητα*, *ἀκοντιστής*, *ἀκονή*, *ἀλισώ*, *ἀναφανδόν*, *Ἄρπυια*, *βουλυτόνδε*, *γαμψώνυξ*, *δηρίομαι*, *διχθά*, *ἐμπάζομαι*, *ἐπιχράω*, *εύρυδεια*, *ἰκετεύω*, *κατά-κρηθεν*, *κλιτύς*, *κράνεια*, *κτεατίζω*, *όδίτης*, *ὄπις*, *παρθένιος*, *παλιμπετές*, *πιέζω*, *πολυφάρμακος*, *πόσε*, *ῥοῖς*, *ῥυτήρ*, *στυγερώς*, *-σχίζω*, *τερμισέις*, *φυκτός*, *χηλός*—33. Of these

ἐμπάζομαι is found in the *Odyssey* ten times, πιέζω six, ἀκονή, ἵκετεύω, ὁδίτης five each. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: -ἀγαπάζω Ω, ἄγγος Β, ἀπονίπτω ΚΩ, βάζω ΔΙΞ, ἔδναΧ, ἔριφος Ω, εὐεργής ΕΝΩ, εὐποίητος Ε, Εύρος Β, κεάζω Τ, λειμών Β, νόστος ΒΙΚ, δλβος Ω, ὑπερώιον Β. Nearly all scholars who divide the *Iliad* into strata assign this book, the *Patrocleia*, to a place in the earliest or near the earliest stratum. The action of this book with its fierce fighting is most unlike the *Odyssey*, the participants, Patroclus, Sarpedon, Glaucus, Hector, Aeneas, Meriones, as well as the god, Apollo, have no part in the later poem, and contrariwise Odysseus and Athena do not appear in any part of the *Patrocleia*. Certainly in action and actors the *Patrocleia* and *Odyssey* are most dissimilar, yet this book has far more Odyssean words than the *Doloneia*.

P. αἴθρη, ἀμφασίη, ἀναιμωτί, ἐσάντα, ἀταρπός, βόθρος, δήμιος, δῆρις, δοκός, ἐλαίη, ἐπακτήρ, ἔρπω, ἐφημοσύνη, ἴνζω, κάτω, μεγάλως, μεθύω, νηκερδής, πόθος, προχοή, -τρύχω—21. Of these ἐλαίη is found in the *Odyssey* eleven times, -τρύχω nine, βόθρος, δήμιος six each. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: κεδνός Ω, Κίκονες Β, each of these words appearing but twice in the *Iliad*, νομεύς ΛΟΣ.

Σ. ἀκμόθετον, ἀμοιβηδής, ἀρδμός, ἀρημένος, Ἀριάδνη, ἄρκτος, ἀρώ, ἀταρπιτός, ἀψόρροος, γάστρη, δαιδάλλω, δαῖς (δαιδῶν), δρεπάνη, εἰνάτετος, ἐννέωρος, ἐρευνάω, εὐσταθής, ζωάγρια, ἡλασκάζω, θαμίζω, κατηρεφής, κυδρός, ληζόμαι, λοετροχός, λοχάω, μυκηθμός, νεήνις, ὅρμος (necklace), ὄρχεομαι, παρθενική, πέλωρ, Πληιάδες, πυράγρη, σέβας, σηκός, σκαίρω, σπόγγος, σταφυλή, τάλαρος, τρίπολος, τρυγάω, ὑλακτέω, φορμιζω—43. Of these ἀρημένος is found in the *Odyssey* six times, εὐσταθής eight, δαῖς, λοχάω ten each, σέβας, σηκός five each. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: νομεύς ΛΟΡ, πολύφρων Φ, ποθέν Ι, ὑπερφιάλως Ν.

T. αἰνηρός, ἄπαστος, ἀσκελέως, ἀτερπής, αὐδήεις, βρῶσις, βρωτός, δειπνέω, δεύτατος, δμώς, καλάμη, λαῖτμα, λίγα, λιμός, Νεοπτόλεμος, νῆστις, οἴήιον, πότε, τελεσφόρος, τηλεκλυτός—20. Although this list is not long, it is remarkable for the frequency with which

some of these words occur in the *Odyssey*, δῆμος thirty-three times, δειπνέω ten, βρῶσις, λαίτημα eight each, αὐδήεις six, λιμός five. The last word, though found in no other book of the *Iliad*, is used in T three times. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἐρυθρός I, χράομαι Ψ.

T. ἀλοτύδηνη, ἀπειρέσιος, ἀνερέπομαι, δυστηλεγής, ἐναργής, εὐρώεις, κερπομίη, κολούω, κτίζω, νευστάζω, οἰνοποτάζω, ὄπποις, οὐρή, παγχάλκεος, πίσος—15. Of these ὄπποις is used in the *Odyssey* five times. The common Odyssean word ἀλλότριος is found in this book and in E.

Φ. ἄγη, ἀλιμυρήεις, ἀλφάνω (ἥλφον), δείελος, δελφίς, δίνη, ἐνταυθοῖ, ἐσπέριος, εὐορμος, θητεύω, ἵτέη, κάγκαυος, κύπειρον, λωφάω, νάω, νέω (to swim), πατροκαστίγνητος, πέλεθρον, περάω (to sell), πόθεν, σαόφρων, συφορβός—22. Of these πόθεν is used in the *Odyssey* thirteen times, ἐσπέριος eight, συφορβός seven. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: πολύφρων Σ, τηλεδαπός Χ.

Χ. ἀθαπτος, αἰνόμορος, ἄκλαντος, ἄκλειως, ἄμαλός, ἄρμονίη, δέσμα, δύσμορος, ἔξονομακλήδην, ἐπίκλοπος, ἐσπερος, ἐτήτυμος, εὐνίς, θάλος, θέρος, ιερήιον, καλύπτηρη, κατηφέω, κερδοσύνη, κερκίς, κεύθος, κοτύλη (a drinking cup), κρύσταλλος, λέκτρον, μήνιμα, οἰμάω, ὄρεστηρος, πλυνοί, -πλύνω, τετραίνω, τίσις, τρωχάω, ὑπάλυξις, ὑψηπετήεις—34. Of these λέκτρον is used in the *Odyssey* nine times, δύσμορος, ἐσπερος, -πλύνω six each. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀτάσθαλος ΛΝ, ἀτασθαλη Δ, ἔδνα Π, τηλεδαπός Φ. This book is the heart of Grote's *Achilleid*, and is equally necessary to the *Menis* of later scholars; cf. Leaf, Introduction to X, "The place of this book in the *Menis* is incontestable." Yet this book in 515 verses has far more Odyssean words, used in but a single book of the *Iliad*, than the *Doloneia* has in 579 verses, so that, while the *Doloneia* has an average of one such word in each thirty-four verses, this Achillean book actually has one in each fifteen.

Ψ. αἴνος, αἰσχρώς, ἀλλοφρονέω, ἀμφιφορεύς, ἀπόπροθι, ἀριφραδής, ἀτέμβω, ἀντμήν, δίδυμοι, δορπέω, ἐλεφαίρομαι, Ἐπεύθ, ἐρέχθω, ἐρπύζω, εὐρυπυλής, λίθεος, μελέδημα, μνήμα, νυμφίος, Οἰδιπόδης, ὅργυια, ὅρομαι, παλαισμοσύνη, παλαίω, πάλη, πανύστατος, ταλαιργός,

*ταχυτής, τεχνάομαι, τορνώ, Φοίνικες*—31. Of these ἀριφραδής, ἀμφιφορεύς are each used in the *Odyssey* six times, ἀπόπορθι five. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: ἀγέλαιος Λ, ἀγρός Ε, ἀληθείη Ω, βουκόλος ΝΟ, εἴδωλον Ε, ἐνδυκέως Ω, κέρδος Κ, κυανόπρωρος Ο, ὑς Κ, χράομαι Τ. Notwithstanding the fact that the games in the presence of the Phaeacians furnished many words used in this book only in the *Iliad*, the number of Odyssean words is relatively small, especially as Ψ has nearly nine hundred verses. Both Leaf and Monro in their respective editions call attention to the assumedly marked Odyssean tone of the vocabulary in the twenty-third book, naming a few of the words found in the *Iliad* in this book only.

Ω. ἀγανοφροσύνη, ἀεικείη, ἀνάρσιος, ἀντιτα, ἄνω, ἀπήνη, ἀπλοίς, ἀποτμος, ἀριστον (τό'), γενετή, γονή, δάος, δέμνιον, δηλήμων, ἔξεσίη, ἐνσκοπος, θῆσθαι, θρηνέω, θυσκόος, ἵππιοχάρμης, κλαυθμός, κλέομαι, ἐπικλώθω, ἐγκονέω, ἡμιόνειος, λύσις, μελεῖστι, δλβιος, πανδαμάτωρ, πείρινς (ινθος), πιθος, πολυνδάκρυτος, πρῆξις, ρυστάζω, σταυρός, τετράκυκλος, τηλίκος, ὑπηνήτης, ὑπνώ, φαεσίμβροτος, φύρω, φωρι-αμός—42. Of these δέμνιον is found in the *Odyssey* twelve times, δλβιος fourteen, κλαυθμός, ἐπικλώθω six each, ἀνάρσιος, φύρω five each. Words frequent in the *Odyssey*, rare in the *Iliad*, but not restricted to this book are: -αγαπάζω Π, ἀλεισον Δ, ἀληθείη Ψ, ἀοιδή Β, ἐνδυκέως Ψ, ἔριφος Π, ἔτος ΒΛ, εὐεργής ΕΝΠ, κάνεον ΙΔ, κεδνός Ρ, ἀπονίπτω, ΚΠ, νοσφίζομαι Β, δλβιος Π, ρήγος Ι, ράβδος Μ, ταμίη Ζ, τράπεζα ΙΔ. It will be observed that of this last list of words five are found in Π, four in Δ, and but two in Ψ—a complete refutation of the statement so often made that the last two books of the *Iliad* have a common and peculiar connection in vocabulary with the *Odyssey*. The last book is supposed to have many Odyssean words, and Leaf in his Introduction to Omega gives a list of some of them and says, "This book resembles Ι, Κ, and Ψ in its kinship with the *Odyssey*, but in a greater degree than any of them." However, as I have just shown, its kinship is with Δ and Π rather than with any of the three books mentioned. There are in this book certain descriptions of scenes which are parallel to descriptions in the *Odyssey*, such as the use of the mule-cart by Priam and by Nausicaa, the description of

Hermes as he meets Priam and as he meets Odysseus, the similar preparations for bed in the hut of Achilles, the home of Menelaus, and the palace of Alcinous. These scenes would probably have been described with similar words by independent and unrelated poets, yet in spite of the similarity of incident this book has only one Odyssean word in each nineteen verses, while X, so unlike the *Odyssey* in its action, has one such word in each fifteen verses.

A similar study has been made of words found in the *Iliad* and in but one book of the *Odyssey*. The average of such words in the *Odyssey* is about twenty-five to each book, or practically the same as the number in each book of the *Iliad* of Odyssean words appearing in but one book of the *Iliad*. Even despised  $\omega$  asserts its independent connection by using thirty-seven words found in the *Iliad*, but found in no other book of the *Odyssey*.

#### CONCLUSION

Each book of the *Iliad* contains certain words found in the *Odyssey* and in that book only in the *Iliad*; in some books, as H, K, M, T, the number of such words is small; in other books, such as A, Α, Π, Σ, X, Ω, the number is large. Thus the argument drawn from vocabulary for assigning the *Doloneia* to the poet or poets of the *Odyssey* applies to each book of the *Iliad* as well, and with greater force to most of the Achillean books. Each book of the *Iliad* has its own peculiar relations with the *Odyssey*, each book of the *Odyssey* its own relations with the *Iliad*, and the argument which assigns the *Doloneia* to the poet of the *Odyssey* assigns each book of the *Iliad* to that poet, and in turn each book of the *Odyssey* to the poet or poets of the *Iliad*.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY  
September 1, 1909

## PHILOSOPHASTER ONCE MORE

BY ANDREW F. WEST

In the last issue of *Classical Philology* (p. 436) Professor Tenney Frank proposes to amend *vir gravis et philosophaster Tullius*, the grimly playful opening of the twenty-seventh chapter in the Second Book of Augustine's *De civitate dei* (Dombart's text), by changing *philosophaster Tullius* to *philosophus M. Tullius*. To justify this he offers three mutually supporting reasons, as follows: "What awakens suspicion against the passage is, firstly, that the word *philosophaster* has a tone of scorn that ill accords with *gravis* which precedes; secondly, that the abusive term is directed against Cicero for whom Augustine usually shows deep regard. To be sure he often disagrees with Cicero, but he seldom applies disrespectful epithets to him." The third reason is purely paleographical: "I would suggest the reading *Vir gravis et philosophus M. Tullius*. The uncial M was probably mistaken for the numeral III, which was then read adverbially *ter*. As a matter of fact Dombart's reading is supported only by a correction of C. The MSS give *philosophus tertullius*, which preserves the second stage of the corruption."

Nevertheless, and with every concession to the brightness of Professor Frank's emendation, the evidence stands decisively in favor of *philosophaster Tullius*, both as appropriate to Augustine's literary habit and also as the evidently true text. Let us consider Professor Frank's three reasons.

1. *Philosophaster* "ill accords with *gravis*" on the two assumptions, but only on the two assumptions that *vir gravis* is used in the passage with the deference of real compliment instead of with a touch of ironical humor, and that the general tone of the passage it introduces is not ironical. But the tone of the entire chapter is keenly ironical. Chapter 27 is one of those brief digressions to which Augustine is so prone. He is always ready to run into an open switch. So it is here. He goes aside a moment to take a quick glance at what seems to him the reprehensible and amusing incongruity between the per-

sonally upright *vir gravis*, "vaunted philosopher [or philosopher], too"—*et philosophaster* or *et philosophus*, as you like it—and his political relation, first as aedile and then as consul, to the legalized immoralities of Roman religion. Here is the passage:

Vir gravis et philosophaster [or philosophus M.?] Tullius aedilis futurus clamat in auribus civitatis inter cetera sui magistratus officia sibi Floram matrem ludorum celebritate placandam; qui ludi tanto devotius, quanto turpius celebrari solent. Dicit alio loco iam consul in extremis periculis civitatis, et ludos per decem dies factos, neque ullam rem quae ad placandos deos pertineret praetermissam; quasi non satius erat tales deos inritare temperantia quam placare luxuria, et eos honestate etiam ad inimicitias provocare quam tanta deformitate lenire.

Here the part about Cicero ends, but the rest of the chapter runs on in the same caustic tone, with some fiery rhetoric added at the end. *Solvitur legendo*. Even if *philosophaster* be out of tune with *gravis*, it is in perfect tune with everything else, for the pathetically inconsistent figure Cicero cuts is the one *point d'appui* of the entire passage. If, however, *vir gravis* itself (for this fixed locution should not be split) becomes a shade humorous here—as is indeed necessary, quite apart from *philosophaster*, in case *vir gravis* is to be in accord with the tone of the passage—then not only do we find everything in tune, but we also get one of those bits of surprising climax in irony which now and then flare in Augustine's writing. *Vir gravis*, "one of our best citizens," standing alone and at the start, is sufficiently and uninterestingly serious. Add *et philosophaster*, "vaunted philosopher, too"—and the *vir gravis* looks uneasy. Who is he? *Tullius!*—and now things are getting interesting, for Augustine is starting in to play a little.

2. We need not be worried by the hypothesis that Augustine would not be likely to apply an "abusive term" or "disrespectful epithet" to Cicero. Is *philosophaster* such an epithet, and, if so, in what degree? Let us see. Outside this instance, the word seems to occur only twice in extant ancient Latin, and both of these times in Augustine's *Contra Iulianum* (op. imperf. v. 11, and vi. 18). Here are the two instances:

Proh Dei atque hominum pudorem! Haecine tam manifesta et ante oculos constituta ab homine non videri, qui valde acutus et eruditus et

philosophaster et dialecticus vult videri (v. 11)—“not seen even by a man who would like to be thought acute, learned, a philosopher of some pretension, and a logician.”

unde etiam Mantuanus poeta naturalium gnarior quam philosophaster Poenorum (vi. 18)—“Virgil the poet has more sense in judging physical questions than the vaunted philosopher of Carthage has.”

*Philosophaster*, then, must not be judged an “abusive term” nor even a “disrespectful epithet” in the ordinary sense. It is a word of curtailed appreciation at best and of disparagement at worst. “Over-rated,” whether by oneself or others, is the root of the implication, but it does not amount to anything like the full-blown suggestion of worthlessness we convey by our word “poetaster.”

After all, it is not a question of personal affront, but of literary polemics. Luther did not mean an insult to the long-dead Aristotle, when in fiery ardor against his philosophy he wrote him down a “verdammter Heide.” Augustine’s wit here is not raw and rough like Luther’s, but has a touch of rather cheerful amusement. No doubt his references to Cicero are usually in the handsome manner. Yet his admiration, though ardent and genuine, was seriously qualified. It was Cicero the unsurpassed orator, stylist and student he admired. He had less regard for him as philosopher and least as statesman. Cicero’s personality was not heroic to him. Even in the famous passage (*Conf.* iii. 4. 7) where he tells how in his youth the *Hortensius* inflamed his soul to seek better things, he writes with reserve: “librum quemdam Ciceronis cuius lingua fere omnes mirantur, pectus non ita.”

Moreover, we need not go outside the *De civitate dei* to find occasional disparagement of Cicero both as statesman and philosopher. In iii. 30 Augustine pictures him as *usque adeo caecus et improvidus futurorum* in his lack of sense to discern the bearing of the threatening political conditions of his time. In iv. 30 he dubs him *iste Academicus* and exposes his philosophical inconsistency and lack of courage to stand to his guns: “nec quod in hac disputatione disertus insonat muttire auderet in populi contione.” Again in v. 9 he raps him for his philosophical evasion, with the added dig that he was hardly acting either bravely or ingenuously.

And Cicero was not his only mark. He even took a shot now and

then at Varro, his *vir undecunque doctissimus*, whose vast and honest learning he admired, almost with awe. Take this well-known hit in vi. 6: "O Marce Varro, cum sis homo omnium doctissimus et sine ulla dubitatione acutissimus, sed tamen homo, non deus." Lastly, on this point, it will not do to forget that in the earlier part of the *De civitate dei*, more fully than elsewhere in his writings, he uses irony, both veiled and open, with great freedom. He is composing the elaborate epitaph of Roman paganism. The Roman deities gave him many chances. So did Aeneas, *pius totiens appellatus* (i. 3). So did certain figures in Roman history—especially when related to Roman religion. A full and superb instance of his veiled irony occurs in xix. 1-3, and with the *homo doctissimus* as victim.

3. After all, the main question is still unanswered. It is not whether the word *philosophaster* "ill accords with *gravis*" or whether Augustine would use "disrespectful epithets" of Cicero, but whether we may believe *philosophaster* is what Augustine wrote. This is purely a question of fact which cannot be settled without resort to the MSS.

Now Professor Frank's paleographical point is that *philosophaster* "is supported only by a correction of C" and that all the other MSS are against it. C is the codex Corbeiensis of Dombart, easily the best MS he used (see Dombart's *Praefatio*, v). Of what the reading is a MS "correction" is not to me quite clear. Probably, however, of *philosophus tertullius*, the admittedly impossible reading of all Dombart's other MSS. Yet, even with the discussion thus far confined to the area of the MSS known to Dombart, we still have in C the best single witness (even with the scribe's correction) ranging itself in favor of *philosophaster*, and all the others giving an impossible reading that must be amended. Now to assume, on this slight basis, that the *ter* in *tertullius* is ||| "read adverbially" and then to assume that this ||| came by miscopying an assumed original uncial M and that this was followed without variation in all the known copies, except in the case of C, is to assume a good deal. It seems to me much more in keeping with what we know of mediaeval scribes to assume that they altered the unfamiliar and puzzling *philosophaster* merely by changing one vowel to another, *a* to *u*, to make the text more intelligible.

Yet even if *philosophus M. Tullius* be given a chance to stand together for inspection as a tentative emendation, it needs to be propped still more by showing that *M. Tullius* accords with Augustine's way of writing Cicero's name. I cannot pretend to have read every mention of Cicero's name in Augustine's writings. But I have gone carefully through the *De civitate dei* on this dreary errand and find that Cicero is named 62 times in all, usually as plain *Cicero*, just as is Augustine's habit with other familiar Roman names, such as *Varro* and *Vergilius*. Plain *Cicero* occurs 48 times, *Marcus Tullius Cicero* (iii. 27) once (in a rhetorical amplification), *Tullius* 12 times, *verbis Tullianis* once (iii. 27), and *M. Tullius* (or *Marcus Tullius*) not at all. The twelve instances of *Tullius* are as follows:

*Tullius loquens*, ii. 21  
*philosophaster Tullius*, ii. 27  
*non elegit locum . . . Tullius*, iii. 31  
*ait Tullius*, iv. 26  
*Tullius . . . ubi loquitur*, v. 13  
*Tullius . . . in libris*, vi. 12  
*ait Tullius*, ix. 5  
*ait Tullius*, xix. 5  
*scribit Tullius*, xxi. 11  
*Tullius admiratur*, xxii. 6  
*ait Tullius*, xxii. 22  
*de re publica Tullius*, xxii. 28.

All these, except iii. 31, are used to quote or refer to Cicero's writings. *Cicero* in the *De civitate dei* is used for Cicero in any phase, *Tullius* (with the one exception noted) for Tully the philosopher or orator—very much as in old-fashioned English literary use. At any rate *M. Tullius* has no sanction from Augustine's usage in the *De civitate dei* and *Tullius* suits it precisely.

Fortunately Dombart's fairly excellent edition has been superseded by a better one. The text of the *De civitate dei* has had only three recensions that need be named here. The first is the Paris text of Dübner in 1838 and the second the Leipzig text of Dombart in 1863 and 1877. Then, latest and best—an *édition définitive* for many moons to come—we have the Vienna text of Hoffmann in 1899. His text is made not only on the basis of a complete and rigorous determination at first hand (a labor neither Dübner nor Dombart

was permitted to accomplish), but rests on more good MSS than were even used before by any modern editor.

*Vir gravis et philosophaster Tullius* is Hoffmann's text, just as it was Dombart's. On what does *philosophaster* rest? On the testimony of C<sup>1</sup>, already referred to, and on much more. The three primary witnesses to the passage in which *philosophaster* lies are L, G, and p. L is the Lyons codex, a semiuncial of the sixth century, the oldest and best copy of that part of the text it preserves. C is the codex Corbeiensis already mentioned, a semiuncial of the seventh century, and p is an unusually good late MS in Paris. Now L, C<sup>1</sup>, and p give the reading *philosophaster tullius*. So does Λ, a fairly high-class ninth-century MS closely related to L. C<sup>2</sup> and p<sup>2</sup> together with all the inferior MSS give the impossible *philosophus tertullius*. Thus the paleographical evidence is decisive, and only purely subjective reasons remain for suspecting this strange-looking *philosophaster*, oddly conspicuous in a company of words otherwise commonplace and familiar.

The fact that it appears only once in the *De civitate dei* and apparently only twice more in Augustine, and in Augustine only, proves nothing either against its existence or against its use elsewhere. Other Latin writers may have used it sparingly. It survives in English here and there. Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, used it. Other survivors of its species in English are the well-known and serviceable "poetaster," with "criticaster" in Swinburne, "politicaster" in L'Estrange, and that *rara avis* "grammaticaster," perched lonely among the vocables of Ben Jonson.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY  
October, 1909

## BENZO OF ALEXANDRIA AND CATULLUS

BY WILLIAM GARDNER HALE

In an article entitled "Bencius Alexandrinus und der Cod. Veronensis des Ausonius," *Rhein. Mus.* LXIII (1908), pp. 224-34, Sabbadini contributes interesting and important particulars about a figure in the group of little-known North-Italian precursors of humanism, who, in the early part of the fourteenth century, occupied themselves with Latin literature.

I shall have occasion in this article to differ at several points from Sabbadini. But I should be sorry to be thought not to share in the gratitude and admiration which all Latinists owe him for his contributions to the history of humanism. He seems to me, in fact, not only enviably fortunate in having at his immediate command the rich store-houses of Italian libraries, but equally enviable for his gift of the power of drawing their lessons from them. One may well apply to him Horace's verse,

Di tibi divitias dederunt artemque fruendi.

The first volume of Benzo's *Universal Chronicle* (preserved to us in the fourteenth-century MS Ambros. B. 24 inf.), which alone remains out of three volumes, indicates, as Sabbadini's examination of it shows, a broad acquaintance with classical as well as mediaeval authors. Among the former, Benzo knew Catullus. I reproduce from Sabbadini's article the passage containing the reference to Catullus, and five of Sabbadini's footnotes. Two of these form the text of my article, while the others are interesting as throwing light upon Benzo's aims. The numbers in the quotation refer to these footnotes.

Bencius durchwanderte vor 1315 das ganze Nord-Italien, zB. Pavia und Ravenna, Como, Bologna, Milano, Acqui, Parma, Verona, in deren Archiven und Kirchen er die Inschriften, die Chroniken und allerlei Urkunden bald auszog bald ausschrieb.<sup>1</sup> Und nicht nur die mittelalterlichen Autoren erforschte er, sondern auch die antiken; er suchte zB. Apuleius, von dem er zwei selbst dem Encyclopädiker Vincentius Bellov.

unbekannt gebliebene Werke fand;<sup>2</sup> suchte, obwohl umsonst, die zweite Dekas des T. Livius<sup>3</sup> und andere Schriftsteller, die er bei Servius namentlich aufgeführt angetroffen.<sup>4</sup> Besonders ergiebig waren seine Forschungen in Verona, wo er Catullus<sup>5</sup> und vom Mansionarius Johannes, wie ich glaube, die *Historia Augusta* erhielt und aus dem hochberühmten Domarchiv "in quo erant libri innumeri et vetustissimi" (f. 145<sup>v</sup>) einen Codex des Ausonius hervorzog.<sup>6</sup>

Benzo then obtained a copy of Catullus for himself (so I understand "erhielt") in Verona. As for Ausonius, Sabbadini thinks (p. 233) that Benzo probably carried off the MS with him, since there is no reference to Ausonius in the *Flores* or in the *Viri illustres* of William of Pastrengo.<sup>1</sup>

The footnotes are as follows:

1. Nach einem Verzeichniss mehrerer Autoren fügt er hinzu: quorum omnium auctorum libros seu chronicas vel scripsi vel partim seriose partim perfunctorie legi.

2. Huius Apulei duos se repperisse libros dicit Vincencius, unum scilicet de vita et moribus Platonis, alium qui intitulatur de deo Socratis. Ego vero alium eiusdem Apulei librum legi, qui intitulatur sic: Apulei Platonici Floridorum; alium quoque librum eiusdem comperi qui intitulatur Asini aurei vel secundum alias intitulatur sic: Lucii Apulei Platonici Madaurensis methamorfoseos liber (f. 280).

3. Quod (lies *quid*) autem Livius hic ponat (über Carthagos Gründung) non legi ex omnibus tribus decadibus, scilicet prima tertia et quarta; puto autem in aliis haberi et maxime in secunda, que nusquam haberi dicitur (f. 135<sup>v</sup>).

4. Servius . . . De civitatibus autem tocius orbis multi quidem ex parte scripserunt, ad plenum tamen Phtolomeus grece, Plinius latine; de italicis etiam urbibus Virgilius (lies *Hyginus*) plenissime scripsit et Cato (ad Aen. VII 678). Actor. Ego vero cum hiis caream auctoris, sequar Ysidorum, Solinum, Egesippum, Iosephum, Ieronimum, Miletum, Librum proprietatum et novissimum omnium Brocardum (f. 126<sup>v</sup>).

5. Ueber den Larius lacus: "Dicit preterea Catullus poeta Veronensis ad amicum Aurelium scribens sic: Poete tenero meo sodali velim occilio papire dicas veronam veniat novi relinquens domi menia lariumque litus" (f. 94, Catull. XXXV 1-4). *Domi* ist Schreibversehen; ebenso *ad Aurelium*? Bemerkenswerth *occilio*, eine besondere Lesart des Oxoniensis.

<sup>1</sup> A similar fate, at a later date, may have befallen the lost Verona MS of Catullus, and it may have disappeared from the world while in private possession. We of the present generation know of the taking out of MSS, with completely good intentions, from a library, and of their destruction by fire while in the hands of the borrower.

The short citation in Note 5 (which I assume to contain the only one from Catullus that occurs in the MS), seems to me of great value from two points of view, as will appear below.

*Occilio* is, as Sabbadini says, the reading of O only. Not only R (the Codex Romanus) but, as my apparatus shows, all the other MSS of the existence of which I have been able to get knowledge,<sup>1</sup> have the reading *cecilio* (saving a few which present the obvious derivatives *cerilio*, *cetilio*, *cecilię*). Sabbadini puts the composition of the Chronicle between 1313 and 1320, and assigns about 1330 for the date of the author's death. Accordingly, the MS from which Benzo made his extract cannot have been O. It may conceivably, of course, have been a MS lying between O and Ver. (I use this abbreviation of *Veronensis* for the "lost Verona" MS, to distinguish it from the Vatican MS known as V.) That is, it may have been a copy of Ver., and from it O itself may have been copied. Or, it may have been a copy of Ver. having no relation to O. Or, again, it may have been Ver. itself. I return later to this question.

Before drawing the inferences suggested by the citation from Benzo, let me repeat certain convictions which I have several times published:

The frequent agreement of G and R against O shows that these two MSS cannot have been separate copies of Ver., but must have been copied from one and the same *descendant* of Ver.; and this descendant, which I shall speak of as *alpha*, was in all probability a copy which Gaspar de' Broaspini caused to be made from Ver. for Coluccio's use (this copy, not G, being the one that was finished on Oct. 19, 1375), in accordance with the well-known letters.<sup>2</sup> Our existing MSS are all descended from OGR, and mainly from the last named.

In the quotation by Benzo, *domi* is, as Sabbadini says, "Schreib-versehen" (for *Comi*). But for "*ad amicum Aurelium scribens*" I have a different solution to offer.

<sup>1</sup> In an article entitled "The Manuscripts of Catullus," *Classical Philology* (1908) III, pp. 233-56, I have published a list of 115 MSS of which I have full collations, and five others belonging to the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, upon which I have memoranda. These collations were made, with the invaluable help of my research assistant, Mr. (now Professor) B. L. Ullman, in pursuance of a plan which I announced in an article entitled "Catullus Once More," published in the *Classical Review* for April, 1906.

<sup>2</sup> Novati, *Epistolario di Coluccio Salutati*, I. 207, 222. Cf. I. 170.

O has interstices before a number of the poems, and against the first verse of a number of others it has two light lines, generally overlooked by editors,<sup>1</sup> in the margin. Before XXXI (and here only, in its whole compass), it has, in addition to the two light strokes in the margin, a formal paragraph mark. With few exceptions, G corresponds, but has a formal paragraph mark where O has light lines. R has an interstice wherever O has either an interstice or the lines. It is clear that the arrangement in *a* and in Ver. was as is vouched for by the substantial agreement of O and G, and that the scribe of R, on the other hand, was working under special intentions or instructions.

In the article in *Classical Philology* referred to, I have shown that there were but a few titles in Ver., and that most of the titles which appear in G and R were devised by the "corrector" of R (R<sup>2</sup>), namely its owner, Coluccio.<sup>2</sup>

Before our poem (XXXV), as elsewhere, O has no title. R<sup>2</sup> wrote in black ink, in the margin, the temporary title *Ad libellum suum de cecilio* (which comes down in the CLA group, with the spelling *cicilio* in LA), and, in the interstice, the same hand wrote, in red ink, the revised title *Ad Cecilium iubet libello loqui*. G<sup>2</sup> wrote, in red ink, the title *Ad Cecilium iubet libello loqui* in the margin. The general evidence makes it most improbable that either of these titles was in O, or even in *a*. But, in any case, neither of them could have suggested *ad amicum Aurelium scribens*.

A different explanation must be found. The one which at once suggested itself to me appears convincing. Let us turn back in O until we reach an interstice. This appears six and a half pages earlier, before poem XXI. The same interstice appears in G, as well as in R. There is no other interstice between XXI and XXXV in G. It follows from these facts that there was an interstice before XXI in Ver., and that this was the first interstice back of XXXV. Now the first verse following our interstice is *Aureli pater exurcionum (-tionum R)*. *Here* is where Benzo got his "friend Aurelius."

The marginal marks of division in Ver. had not saved him. They were very likely unobtrusive, as they are in O. Benzo may not

<sup>1</sup> Merrill (*Catullus*, 1893) notes nearly all.

<sup>2</sup> As I showed in the same article, G got its paragraph marks, like most of its titles, variants, and corrections, from M, one of the daughters of R. But the argument is the same.

have noticed them at all; or, if he noticed them, he probably thought them simply indications of subdivisions in a long poem. Seven signs with precisely this intent appear in LXII in GR and M, formed in R and M of light strokes meeting at a right angle at one end, and taking in G the form of regular and clear paragraph marks.

In passing, I may say that Benzo's citation practically proves that there were no titles in Ver. between XXI and XXXV, a conclusion which harmonizes with the view which I had independently reached for most of the poems, including XXI-XXXV.

The poem from which Benzo inferred the friendship of the two men is an abusive one. With a break of only one poem, it is preceded by two others, XV and XVI, of a similar character. Catullus made his attitude toward Aurelius plain; but Benzo does not know it.

There are many changes of subject, and many different persons, gods, or places addressed, between XXI and XXXV—Varus, Furius, Iuuentius, Thallus, Furius again, the poet's cupbearer, Veranius and Fabullus, Romulus, Alfenus, Sirmio, Ipsicilla (?), Vibennius and his son, and Diana. Benzo did not know this; for, if he had, he could not have supposed that this long succession of pages formed a single poem, addressed to Aurelius.

On these facts I base an important conclusion, which, while not inevitable, is highly probable, namely:

*Benzo did not really know Catullus.* In the only part where we have any indication that he had any acquaintance with his author at all,<sup>1</sup> he had read only the poem from which he cites. He had not read XV or XVI. From XXI to XXXIV he had not read. He had looked at his author, not "seriose," but "perfunctorie."

But (and here is my second conclusion) *a man who knew his author so little can hardly have possessed a manuscript of that author.* It is much more likely that Benzo was turning over "perfunctorie" a manuscript in the possession of another person, or of a library. We know pretty surely that there was a MS of Catullus in the Cathedral Library in Verona, and that Benzo rummaged about in this library (he himself says of it, "in quo erant libri innumeri et vetus-

<sup>1</sup> For his method, compare his own account, in Sabbadini's note 1, of his treatment of the historians and chroniclers from whom he drew: "vel scripsi vel partim seriose partim perfunctorie legi."

tissimi"). It is altogether probable, then, that Benzo used the lost Verona MS itself, in the Cathedral Library.

This brings us to a summing-up of the meaning of Benzo's citation from my first point of view. It appears to be commonly assumed, as by Sabbadini in the case of Benzo, that a man who, in the fourteenth century, cites an author (unless the same citation appears in a Latin classic) possessed a copy of that author; and there appears to be a disposition to reconstitute private libraries on this basis. I have always questioned this position on general grounds; but, so far as I know, Benzo's citation affords us the first means of testing it. It does not bear the test, and the position must be abandoned.

An application may be made in a particular case. On p. 1 of *Le Scoperte dei Codici Latini e Greci ne' Secoli XIV e XV*, Sabbadini says of the poem *Ad patriam venio* that it "dev' essere stato scritto dal Campesano sulla sua copia di Catullo." I doubt that Benvenuto possessed a copy. I am more inclined to think that his verses were written at the end of the Verona MS, either by Benvenuto himself, or, less probably, by some one who had a copy of his verses. They are in both G and R (in the latter, at the beginning), and were, therefore, probably in *a*. It is more likely, on general grounds, that the copyist of *a* got them from the MS which he was copying than that he happened, just at this moment, to have another copy of Catullus at hand.<sup>1</sup> In addition, I have shown ("Classical Review," *loc. cit.*) that the note at the end of G was copied (compare Châtelain's previous suggestion) from *a*; and in this note the scribe (of *a*) explicitly says that he *had* no MS of Catullus at hand except the one from which he was copying.

There is nothing improbable in the hypothesis that an early fourteenth-century scholar felt free to enter extraneous matter in a

<sup>1</sup> Sabbadini, *op. cit.* 4, says that the Veronese "Gaspare de Broaspini . . . aveva un Catullo." The evidence relied upon (the letters of Coluccio) does not seem to me to justify the conclusion. All that appears from the letters is that there was a MS within reach of Gaspar, from which Coluccio wanted a copy made. This may perfectly well have been the MS in the Verona Cathedral Library.

But the fact that Coluccio had a copy made from the MS sent him, instead of simply keeping that MS, suggests another possibility,—which I put forward as no more than such. Gaspar, having a copy (our *a*) written (quite conceivably correcting it himself, as Coluccio corrected his own MS), and knowing that Coluccio was willing merely to borrow for the purpose of transcribing and had abundant scribes at command, may have asked Coluccio to return the copy to him. If this took place, and the copy reached him in safety, he then "possessed Catullus."

library MS which he was reading; for there is proof that *marks* of some kind, at any rate, were made in this particular MS by such a reader or readers. Against five of the seven passages included by Jeremy of Montagnone in his *Compendium Moralium Notabilium* (all except LXVI, 15-16 and LXVIII, 137), R has in the margin either a pointing hand or a brace or a Nō (= *nota bene*). This cannot be mere coincidence. The only reasonable explanation is that these indications of special interest came down through *a* from Ver., that is, that the scribe or corrector of *a* repeated, in one form or another, the indications which he found in Ver., and that Coluccio (for the work is his) again repeated them from *a* when he corrected his MS R. As for the origin of these marks in the margin of Ver., the probability is that Jeremy himself made them in preparation for his book of selections. Of course it is possible that somebody had made the marks before Jeremy read the MS; though it is less likely that he would accept the choice of someone else than that he would make his own. But, in any case, these marks, no matter who made them, clearly served him for a guide in taking his excerpts.

This view falls in with the fact that the passage quoted in the *Flores* (which is dated 1329) is one of Jeremy's quotations, and one of the five passages out of Jeremy's seven that are marked in R. Probably the author of the *Flores*, looking at the Verona Catullus for something to quote (and this was after Jeremy's death in 1320-21) had his attention attracted by marks of interest which he found there, and made his selection from the passages thus singled out. It is an interesting fact, too, that the passage which he took is the earliest of Jeremy's passages.

There is only one conceivable escape from this conclusion, namely in the hypothesis that Jeremy himself possessed a copy of the Verona MS and entered these marks upon the copy, *and* that it is from Jeremy's MS, and not from Ver., that G and R are descended. But this will not serve. It is extremely probable, in the light of Coluccio's three letters, that the MS of Catullus of which he was asking Gaspar for a copy was the one which, as we pretty surely know, was in the Verona Library. This is enough to account for GR. To suppose that a MS of Catullus belonging to Jeremy had also come into the possession of this same library is to assume a highly improbable coincidence where a simple explanation is already at hand.

The general scepticism which I have expressed above with regard to drawing inferences of ownership is thus confirmed, and made to cover even more ground. Here is Jeremy, with *seven* excerpts from Catullus! Relatively, this is very strong evidence in favor of possession. Yet we have seen that, in all human probability, Jeremy did not possess a copy, but used the Verona MS.

What has thus been established, with as much approach to certainty as is likely often to be attainable in such matters, in the case of two different early fourteenth-century men who cite an author, one of them even in seven passages, should make us weigh evidence very carefully in considering any question of the possession of MSS in the period dealt with. My own feeling is that, in the lack of positive proof of some kind, only the evidence afforded by a real acquaintance with an author on the part of a given man should lead us to credit him with the ownership of a manuscript of that author.

This position is in turn somewhat reinforced by a consideration of another kind. All our existing MSS of Catullus, as it seems to me, can be carried back to an origin in OG or R, or (in a few cases) a combination of two of these MSS. There is no trace of the influence of any MS outside of these three. If we had to believe, on the evidence of a citation or an imitation, that not only Petrarch (the case is somewhat different with him, and is complicated) but Benzo, Benvenuto, Jeremy, Mussato, the author of the *Flores*, and William of Pastrengo (to say nothing of Gaspar), possessed each a copy, it would be hard to think that these copies had all passed away without leaving a descendant or a trace of influence among the hundred and fifteen MSS which we still possess. Of course manuscripts disappear, and one who looks for a steady succession of mother, daughter, granddaughter, etc., has to put up with disappointments. But for the three great manuscripts there is no lack of descendants, or evidence of influence, at *some* stage of removal. It would be a strange disparity if precisely the opposite had happened in the case of every one of *seven* other manuscripts which would rank with OGR. It should be remembered, too, what difficulty Coluccio had in procuring a copy, either to own or to get transcribed.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It will be seen that I do not incline to Ellis's view that the variants in our earlier MSS are to be assigned to a comparison of early copies of Ver., in the text of which various readings had arisen in the process of copying.

Thus far my discussion has had to do with the question of the dissemination of MSS of the Latin classics in the first half of the fourteenth century. But Benzo's citation has another bearing also.

In endeavoring to reconstruct the text of the lost Verona archetype from O, G and R, we have, roughly speaking, two traditions to deal with, that of O on the one hand, and that of G and R together, as representing *a*, on the other hand. Other things being equal, we should balance the one tradition against the other. But the question is, *Are* the other things equal? What is the general temper of the scribe of O, and what the tempers of the scribes of *a*, G and R? Did these men aim simply to copy what was before them, or did they try to emend where they thought they found error? Were they careful or were they careless? Were they painstaking in endeavoring to preserve everything, or were they easily content with a part? Our answers with regard to these questions (and they are very difficult ones) will not only be important for the text of Catullus, but will contribute toward an understanding of the general methods of late fourteenth-century scribes and correctors, and so have bearings for the text of other authors. I shall sometime discuss the evidence in full. In the present paper, I am concerned only with what may be learned from Benzo's citation.

The agreement of Benzo with O in reading *occilio* where *a* (as proved by G and R) has *cecilio* shows that Ver. had *occilio*, and that the scribe of *a*, or a possible corrector of *a* (who, as already suggested, may have been Gaspar himself), made an easy emendation based upon the occurrence of *cecilia* (for *cecilio*) in the last verse of the poem. There is very little likelihood that the scribe of Benzo's extant volume, if it was written after O, happened to know this particular MS or a now lost descendant of it, and made Benzo's reading conform. O then is shown, at this point, to reflect the lost archetype more faithfully than GR.

But another difference of reading is also covered by Benzo's citation, namely in the word *menia*, which undoubtedly represents what Catullus wrote. O has *ueniā*. G had *meniam*, of which the last letter (the z-shaped *m*) has been erased. R reads *menia* now; but above the *a* a delicate erasure can be made out, which, though no color is left, corresponds perfectly in shape to a virgula in the

style of the scribe. OG and R thus agree upon a final *m*, which Benzo, or the writer of the extant MS of his work, rejected. But did *ueniam* or *meniam* stand in the lost archetype? The latter is not an existing word, the former is. A correction from a certain error to an existing and familiar word, even though we now recognize that this is not the right word, is more likely than a correction from an existing word to a non-existing one. On general principles, then, we should say that the archetype read *meniam*. But we no longer have to rely on general probability. The agreement of Benzo with GR against O *proves*, in connection with the agreement of O and GR about the last letter, that the archetype read *meniam*. Then it was the scribe of O that was at fault, either through fully intentional emendation, or (with a half glance at the word) half-unconscious emendation, or by simple blundering. In any case, it is here O that misrepresents the reading of Ver., while *a* preserves it, in spite of its being partly wrong.

Thus Benzo's citation, as a whole, proves both traditions to have erred, one in one place and one in the other, and, so far as its sole evidence goes, leaves the balance even.

## HIEREMIAS DE MONTAGNONE AND HIS CITATIONS FROM CATULLUS

By B. L. ULLMAN

Hieremias de Montagnone, a Paduan judge, put together, about the year 1300, a book of quotations from ancient and mediaeval writers which he called *Compendium moralium notabilium*. Perhaps the most interesting fact about this work for the classical student is that Hieremias quotes seven passages from Catullus, and thus furnishes us one of the first *testimonia* to that author after the resurrection of his work early in the fourteenth century. The quotations are all the more important because none of the extant MSS of Catullus was written before 1350.<sup>1</sup>

The definite contributions which I have to make on the subject under discussion are, first, the report of an examination for the Catullus citations of a number of hitherto unused MSS of Hieremias' work; second, a solution, which I believe to be both simple and conclusive, of the problem which these citations present to us and with which all students of the MS tradition of Catullus are familiar; and third, some interesting sidelights on the "lost Verona" MS of Catullus. The net result of this investigation will in my opinion be of great importance to Catullus students, for it will end in the exaltation of O to a point higher than any reached by it heretofore as a witness of the text of the Veronensis, and thus of Catullus himself.

First of all, it is necessary to date the work of Hieremias as closely as possible. The authority of Scardeonius,<sup>2</sup> who says that Hieremias died about 1300, was followed by Ellis in his large edition of Catullus (1878)<sup>3</sup> and by Wheeler, the most recent writer on the subject.<sup>4</sup> It has, however, been definitely settled by Rajna,<sup>5</sup> by means

<sup>1</sup>This is the earliest date that has been suggested for the Oxoniensis (O), Hale *Classical Review*, April, 1906. But he has since given reasons that make against so early a date, *Class. Phil.* III (1908), p. 243.

<sup>2</sup>*De Antiquitate Urbis Patavii*, ed. Basil. (1560), p. 235.

<sup>3</sup>*Proleg.*, p. ix.

<sup>4</sup>"Hieremias de Montagnone and Catullus," *AJP*, XXIX (1908), p. 186.

<sup>5</sup>*Studi di Filologia Romana* V (1891), p. 193 ff. Ellis *Catullus in the XIVth Century* (1905), p. 8, mentions Rajna and adopts his conclusions, but curiously enough fails to give the reference. I am indebted for it to the late Professor Traube.

of official documents of the city of Padua, that Hieremias became judge in 1280 and died in 1320-21. Between these two dates the *Compendium* must have been produced, for Hieremias was already judge when he published the work, as we know from the title itself. Rajna adopts 1290-1300 as a safe compromise between the two extremes, though admitting that he has no real argument for his choice. Granting that this date is approximately correct, must we therefore assume that Hieremias read Catullus before 1300? By no means. There is direct evidence that the Catullus citations and perhaps others were added later. One of the MSS of the *Compendium*, Bodleian Canon. Lat. 212, of the fifteenth century,<sup>1</sup> omits every one of the seven Catullus passages. Citations from other authors also are lacking, which appear in the other MSS.<sup>2</sup> That these omissions were accidental is out of the question. That they were intentional on the part of the copyist is very unlikely. It would seem, then, that this MS is descended from an early edition of the *Compendium*, made before the discovery of Catullus, or at least before Hieremias had read that author. How many editions in various states of completion there may have been it is not possible for me to say. There is, however, evidence of one intermediate edition. Casanatensis 312 (C. iv. 11), a MS dated 1398, omits the two Catullus passages that Hieremias cites last. It is conceivable, of course, that these omissions are accidental, but it is more probable that this MS is descended from one which was copied from the original before Hieremias had inserted all the quotations in his work.<sup>3</sup> Further light should come from a thorough investigation of the MSS of the *Compendium*. In my opinion the Catullus passages were added after 1300, perhaps as late as 1310. The Verona MS of Catullus does not seem to have been discovered before that time; at least,

<sup>1</sup>This MS was evidently known to Ellis, for in his book, *Catullus in the XIVth Century*, he speaks of two Bodleian MSS—the other being Canon. Miscell. 186, used for his large edition of Catullus. He, however, says nothing of the omission of the Catullus passages.

<sup>2</sup>I noted omissions of part of the Sallust quotations and the one from Vergil's *Georgics* in iii. 4. 8, of those from Ovid *De Rem. Am.* and Paul *Ad Eph.* in iv. 4. 8, and of the one from *Ecclesiastes* in iv. 6. 3.

<sup>3</sup>The omission of one passage (51. 15, 16) in Paris, N. a. l. 1779 (dated 1475), and of another (39. 16) in Paris, lat. 6469 (of about the same date), I consider accidental.

the earliest datable reference to it is by Bencius Alexandrinus, who examined it shortly before 1315.<sup>1</sup>

The puzzle about the Catullus passages in the *Compendium* has been the manner of citing, not according to poems as we cite from Catullus at present, but according to chapters, *capitula*, which do not correspond to our division of the poems. There cannot be the least doubt that Hieremias used the term *capitulum*, not *liber*, which is found only sporadically in the MSS, as may be seen from the reports given below. That the abbreviations *c.* and *ca.* are to be taken as *capitulo* and not *capite*, is perhaps not entirely proved by the abbreviations *ca<sup>o</sup>* and *c<sup>o</sup>* which are found in some MSS, nor by the occurrence of the full word in one passage in the Venice edition. These facts may merely show that the original abbreviation (probably *c.*) was taken as *capitulo* by the scribes. Hieremias' use of the same form in quoting from other works, prose and verse, and the interpretation of it as *capitulo* by the scribes and the Venetian printer, in these passages also, serve to confirm this interpretation. Moreover, a common use of *capitulum* as applied to poetry not only suggests that this is the word that Hieremias meant, but also shows how it is to be understood. The use referred to is in designation of one of a number of poems. For example, in codex R of Catullus, R<sup>9</sup> (fourteenth century) has written *cap<sup>o</sup>* in the margin of poem 67 to indicate that a new poem begins there. Codex F of Propertius (fourteenth century) uses *capitulum* as a term for a new poem.<sup>2</sup> The word is regularly used in this sense in a MS of Petrarch's *Trionfi* (Bodl. Canon. ital. 70).<sup>3</sup> The forms *carmen* and *charta* (*carta*), which may be thought of as possible expansions of the abbreviation *c.*, may be summarily dismissed. The latter will not solve the riddle of the Catullus citations. The former seems not to have been used by Hieremias at all, even in quoting from Horace's *Odes*, if the Venice edition is to be trusted, for in this we find such forms as *Od. li. 2. c. 10* followed by *Od. li. 2. cap. 16*—the passages being from odes 10 and 16 respectively of the second book.

<sup>1</sup> Sabbadini, "Bencius Alexandrinus und der cod. veronensis des Ausonius," *Rhein. Mus.* LXIII (1908), p. 225.

<sup>2</sup> *Lib. iii. c. 4.* So also Baehrens' critical apparatus in his edition of Propertius (1880).

<sup>3</sup> The term, found also in other MSS of the *Trionfi*, was no doubt used by Petrarch himself. See Appel *Die Triumphe Francesco Petrarca* (1901), p. 2, note.

We see, then, that the natural way to take the word *capitulum* is as a synonym for *carmen*, poem. Since, however, this explanation does not correspond with the poem division of Catullus as shown by the MSS, various other interpretations have been suggested. Bywater<sup>1</sup> and Baerhens<sup>2</sup> thought that the quotations were taken from a florilegium divided into chapters, but Ellis<sup>3</sup> rightly objected to this explanation on the grounds that we have no evidence of the existence of such a florilegium, and especially because the *capitula* are numerically arranged to agree with the order of the poems in our Catullus MSS, i. e., the farther on in the Catullus collection a given poem occurs, the larger is the number of Hieremias' *capitulum* quoting from that poem. Ellis himself thought that the citations were taken from a complete MS of Catullus, though he did not explain the numbering of the *capitula*. In his later work<sup>4</sup> he suggested that the "lost Verona" MS, from which he believed Hieremias drew his citations, "was divided into short books or sections, which fell out from the later transcripts, giving way to the division into separate poems, with their titles, which also formed part of the same codex." He also suggested that these sections were the original *libelli* of which the collection was formed. Wheeler<sup>5</sup> put forth the theory that Hieremias' MS was entirely different from the MSS we possess, that it was, in fact, divided into ten sections on the basis of the meter employed, and that these were the *capitula* of Hieremias. This theory is based on the false premise that Hieremias speaks of ten *capitula*, whereas he speaks of twelve.<sup>6</sup> A great deal of twisting and squeezing is also necessary to make the scheme fit the facts. Besides, it is inherently improbable that Hieremias' MS was not a descendant of the Veronensis. Peiper<sup>7</sup> expressed the opinion that Hieremias himself divided the work into convenient sections, though making use of divisions already existing in his MS, and perhaps merely numbering sections marked off by titles. It was only inherent probability that led Peiper to this conclusion, for he found no support

<sup>1</sup> Ellis' edition (1878), *Proleg.*, p. xi.

<sup>2</sup> *Catulli Veronensis Liber* (1876), *Proleg.*, p. lviii.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>4</sup> *Catullus in the XIVth Century*, pp. 7, 8.

<sup>5</sup> *AJP*. XXIX, pp. 186 f.

<sup>6</sup> See the reports from the MSS at the end of this article.

<sup>7</sup> *Q. Valerius Catullus, Beiträge zur Kritik seiner Gedichte* (1875), p. 22.

for it in the MSS of Catullus, as he himself confesses: "Sein codex müsste dann allerdings sehr stark in dieser beziehung von den uns bekannten abgewichen sein." He goes on to say that the Veronensis probably had fewer titles than the existing MSS.

If Peiper had examined Hieremias' usage for other authors more thoroughly at the time when he wrote his book, he would have found strong support for his suggestion. He did, it is true, note that the *Tobias* of Matthaeus Vindocinensis had been divided by Hieremias into chapters for the purpose of quotation, but he did not work out the details of this division. It seems strange that no student of Catullus, and especially Peiper, has called attention to the fact that Seneca's *Tragedies* and Terence are quoted by *capitula* exactly as Catullus is. The Seneca citations were later published by Peiper himself,<sup>1</sup> who noted that Hieremias numbered the separate scenes and *cantica* in his MS as "chapters." The same is true for Terence. A few illustrations from the *Andria* and the *Phormio* will suffice. *And.* 67 is cited a number of times (ii. 2. 1; iii. 3. 5, etc.) as being in chap. iii. In the MSS, the *periocha* forms "chapter" i; the prologue "chapter" ii. and Act I, sc. 1 (where vs. 67 is found) "chapter" iii. Vs. 191 is said (iv. 5. 5) to be in chap. iv, and it is in the fourth division of the MSS; 266 is in the sixth "chapter," according to Hieremias (iii. 1. 8) and the MSS; 305 and 307 are in the seventh (iv. 4. 10; iv. 5. 11); 426 in the tenth (i. 3. 4); 555 in the fourteenth (iv. 5. 5). *Phorm.* 41 is quoted from chap. iii. (ii. 5. 3; iv. 3. 1). In the MSS the *periocha* is the first section (the didascalic notice, written in capitals, being part of the title), the prologue is the second, and Act I, sc. 1 (in which 41 occurs) is the third. Thereafter 77 is in the fourth chapter according to Hieremias (ii. 6. 12) and the MSS; 203 in the sixth (v. 1. 1); 241 in the seventh (v. 3. 1); 454 in the tenth (i. 3. 7); 562 in the thirteenth (ii. 3. 9); 696 in the seventeenth (iii. 6. 5). The agreement between Hieremias' statements and one group of Terence MSS continues throughout. I shall have more to say about the citations from Terence as well as some from other authors at another time.

We may state Hieremias' principle of numbering in the case of those poetical works in which no scheme of numbering according to

<sup>1</sup> *De Senecae tragoeiarum vulgari lectione (A) constituenda*, Breslau (1893), p. 21.

books or otherwise existed, as follows: he gave a consecutive numbering to the sections formed by the interposition of red-letter titles or headings.

For the sake of convenience I group here the passages which Hieremias quotes from Catullus and the "chapters" to which he assigns them. The text is given farther on.

22.	18-20	= cap. v
39.	16	= " v
51.	15-16	= " v
64.	143-48	= " viii
66.	15-16	= " ix
68.	137	= " ix
76.	13	= " xi, <i>et penult.</i>

Hieremias' MS, therefore, was divided, presumably by red titles, into twelve sections. Did the "lost Verona" MS present any such appearance? We know from the agreement of MSS O and G,<sup>1</sup> that many, though by no means all, of the poems were separated from each other by a blank space of one verse. This divided the MS into at least 27 sections—obviously not the ones Hieremias numbers. Other poems were distinguished merely by some mark, as in O. In these places neither O nor G left a space. The omission by O of all titles, even at the beginning, makes it more difficult to say what titles the Verona MS had. Nearly all the titles in G and all those in R are by second hands. Before inserting these red-ink titles, R<sup>2</sup> (in a few cases R<sup>1</sup>) put catch-titles of black ink in the margins as a guide. R<sup>1</sup> supplied the catch-titles for 4, 5, and 6.<sup>2</sup> R<sup>2</sup> altered the form of these somewhat in copying them. In G at these points it was G<sup>1</sup>, not G<sup>2</sup>, who wrote the titles, and what is more, in the form in which R<sup>1</sup> gives the catch-titles. The bookheading at the beginning (*Catulli Veronensis liber Incipit*) was also written by G<sup>1</sup>, but no other titles were made by him. Evidently these titles were found by GR in their archetype, and probably they were also

<sup>1</sup> It is universally conceded that O and G are very close to the "lost Verona" MS. That R is the ancestor of most of the other MSS, including M and D, and is on a par with G, is a conclusion which is bound to be accepted sooner or later by all scholars. Professor Hale believes that O is a direct copy of the Veronensis, and that G and R are copies of a lost copy of the Veronensis (*Class. Phil.* III, pp. 233 f.). His position is adopted in this paper.

<sup>2</sup> Hale *Class. Phil.* III, pp. 246 f.

in the Veronensis. Probability becomes certainty when we examine O. This MS leaves room for a colored initial, by putting the first letter in the margin as a catch-letter and by indenting the first two lines in poems 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 (three lines are indented in the first poem). In poems 7 and 9-60 there is no space left for an initial, and there is no catch-letter, the first letter being part of the line.<sup>1</sup> The only thing that distinguishes the poems is the blank space of one line preceding them and the use of very slight catch-paragraph marks (//), which, however, are missing in 7. The colored initials were supplied for 1 and 2 (at a later time?) but not for the others. In as faithful a copy as O certainly is,<sup>2</sup> we have a right to believe that the difference in treatment of poems 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 is based on a difference in its archetype, the Veronensis. We see from GR that the Verona MS probably had titles for 1,<sup>3</sup> 4, 5, and 6. Thus OGR point to an unusual appearance in the Veronensis for 1, 4, and 5. This unusual appearance, to my mind, was the presence of colored titles and initials. According to O, the same was true for 8, judging from its indentation there, but according to GR, it was true, not of 8, but of 6, judging from their first-hand titles to 6. O does not even leave a space before 6, but merely has the catch-paragraph marks. In other places where this occurs in O, G<sup>1</sup> has left no indication of a separation, G<sup>2</sup> putting in a marginal title and a paragraph mark. In this case, however, G<sup>1</sup> left a space, inserted a title, and indented for the initial. The title which R<sup>1</sup>G<sup>1</sup> have is *ad se ipsum*, changed by R<sup>2</sup>G<sup>2</sup> to *ad flauium*. The *ad se ipsum* title obviously does not belong to 6, but to 8, which is *just a page* farther on, and there is where it was placed by R<sup>2</sup>G<sup>2</sup>. O is therefore right: the Verona MS had no break at 6, but did have a break with title *ad se ipsum* and initial at 8. The archetype of GR wrongly placed this title one page farther back, before 6. Again the faithful O points to title and initial in the Verona MS for poem 2, though no title is given by R<sup>1</sup>G<sup>1</sup>. No doubt the Veronensis had one, and the archetype of GR failed to copy it. These titles and

<sup>1</sup> Except that in 13, 14, and 15 there is a catch-letter, but without indentation.

<sup>2</sup> See below, p. 77.

<sup>3</sup> Rather a book-heading, not title, above 1. That the Veronensis always had a book-heading is not certain. See below, p. 78. The argument here made is not affected.

initials thus divided the first 60 poems of the Veronensis into five sections, as follows:

Poem 1	= Section 1
“ 2-3	= “ 2
“ 4	= “ 3
“ 5-7	= “ 4
“ 8-60	= “ 5

It will be seen that Hieremias cites 22. 18-20; 39. 16; 51. 15, 16 from *capitulum* 5, and that all three fall into our fifth section. Thus the greatest difficulty about the citations has been explained, the fact that four *capitula* preceded poem 22, while one *capitulum* included at least 22 to 51.

Let us now see how the rest of the Veronensis must have appeared. In O poem 60 ends on fol. 14v, the rest of the page (five lines) is left blank, and 61 is started on the next page after another space of one line. Nowhere else does O leave a space at the bottom of a page merely in order to begin a new poem at the top of the next page. For example, poem 50 begins two lines from the bottom of fol. 12v after a space of one line. It seems to me that we are justified in assuming that there was more than a mere space of one line in the Veronensis before 61, that very probably there was a title. This would be the beginning of section 6. It may well be that the Veronensis also began 61 on a new *folium*, after leaving several lines blank on the previous page, as in O. In this state of affairs we may perhaps see a trace of the putting together of the Catullian *liber*. Perhaps one of the ancestors of the Veronensis, or even the Veronensis itself, was put together from two (or more) MSS, the first one (or ones) containing poems 1 to 60, the second one (or group of ones) containing poems 61 to 116. Possible confirmation of this suggestion is found in the *Explicit epithalamium* which follows 61 in O. This gives a distinctive air to the poem, as if it had once stood alone, for nothing similar to it is found with any other poem.<sup>1</sup> At any rate, the phrase (perhaps in red ink in the Veronensis) emphasizes the division between poems 61 and 62. Thus our section 7 begins with 62. G begins 63 as a new poem, with space and initial, but O merely has the catch-paragraph marks without break. We may

<sup>1</sup> Another hint of the same sort is found below, p. 76.

follow the more trustworthy O and consider 63 as part of section 7. In the case of 64, O simply leaves a space of one line. This would not be sufficient to permit us to assume a new section beginning with 64. But at the beginning of this poem there are glosses and variants in O by the same hand which wrote glosses and variants at the beginning of the book.<sup>1</sup> These notes at the beginning are surely derived from the archetype, the Veronensis. (Cf. in 3. 14 the superscribed *i. pulcra* in both O and G [by G'] and the striking agreement of the marginal notes to 2 with the remarks of Guilelmus de Pastrengo, who, therefore, must have used the Veronensis or O itself).<sup>2</sup> It is thus extremely likely that the glosses in 64 also were to be found in the Verona MS. These alone would attract attention to the poem and would serve to distinguish it from the preceding poem, even if there was no title. The marginal note to the first line, especially (*narrat hic ystoriam aurei velleris*), attracts attention to the break. Thus the eighth section of the Veronensis began with 64. Hieremias quotes 64. 143-8, assigning the passage to *capitulum 8*.

Beginning with 65 a different method of indicating new poems is adopted in O. In addition to the one line space, there is an illuminated initial (different in style from those in poems 1 and 2) in the margin; the second letter is a capital in line with the first letters of the other lines; then the rest of the word is written close to it without the usual space between. I give an illustration from 72:

D<sub>Icebas</sub>  
L<sub>esbia</sub>  
D<sub>ilexi</sub>

Other poems are distinguished in the same way, with two exceptions: there is no one-line space preceding them (nor is there any in G) and instead of an illuminated initial there is only a catch-letter. It is possible that the striking difference between the treatment of new poems in the earlier and later parts of the book is due merely to the caprice of the scribe of O. Two reasons lead me to believe that this is not true; first, because O in other respects is so faithful in reproducing just what he found; and second, because the reading *Vltas* instead of *Multas*, in 101. 1, which both G and R (and therefore

<sup>1</sup> See facsimile of the page in Châtelain *Paléographie des classiques Latins* XV. A, or Merrill's *Catullus* (1893).

<sup>2</sup> See Schulze in *Hermes* XIII, p. 57.

their archetype) originally had, makes it certain that the Veronensis had the word in a form very similar to that of O: *m Vltas* (catch-letter *m*). A second possibility is that the scribe of the Veronensis introduced the new system into the later poems, or that these were written by another scribe. Lastly, it may be that the Veronensis or one of its ancestors was put together from separate *libelli*, as has been suggested above (p. 11), and that a new *libellus* began with poem 65. However this may be, O gives us little help from 65 on, in determining the sections of Hieremias. We may assume that 65 with its new system began a new section—section 9. Hieremias quotes 66. 15, 16 from *capitulum* 9 (there is no break at 66). 68. 137, also, is quoted from the ninth “chapter.” There is no break at 67 in OG, but there is one at 68 which we must ignore. There are breaks in OG at 69 and 72, which began sections 10 and 11 of Hieremias’ division, for 76. 13 is quoted from “chapter” 11, which at the same time is called the penultimate “chapter.” After 76 there are breaks at 77, 80, and 89 in OG. The twelfth and last chapter must begin with one of these. Our choice is not difficult: in R there is found in the margin of 77 a catch-title *ad rufum* by the first hand.<sup>1</sup> As this title no doubt comes from the Veronensis, we are safe in letting section 12 begin with this poem. G’s failure to preserve the title suggests that he failed to preserve other titles. If the archetype of GR was equally negligent occasionally, we can see why no titles have come down to us for some of the other sections.

The scheme of division, then, that Hieremias, following the indications of his MS, used was as follows:

Poem	1	=	<i>Capitulum</i>	i
“	2-3	=	“	ii
“	4	=	“	iii
“	5-7	=	“	iv
“	8-60	=	“	v
“	61	=	“	vi
“	62-63	=	“	vii
“	64	=	“	viii
“	65-68	=	“	ix
“	69-71	=	“	x
“	72-76	=	“	xi
“	77-116	=	“	xii

Whether Hieremias imposed this numbering on the Veronensis itself or on a copy it is impossible to determine.

<sup>1</sup> Hale *op. cit.*, p. 247.

Let us stop to summarize briefly. O, by its indentions, shows us that the first sixty poems of the Veronensis were divided into five sections. In four cases out of the five, confirmation is added by three first-hand titles in G and R which must go back to the Verona MS. After poem 60 there are the following indications of new sections: the unusual space of five verses in O after poem 60, with the consequent beginning of 61 on a new *folium*; the "Explicit epithalamium" at the end of 61 in O; the glosses in the margin of O in 64; the new method of beginning poems in O from 65 on; the first-hand catch-title in R at 77. Thus we have indications of various kinds for the beginnings of ten of the twelve sections. We have had no serious conflicting evidence to be explained away, nor do we have any for the remaining two sections. We are confronted here merely by a lack of evidence. We know from the MSS that there *may* have been new sections at 68, 69, 72, 80, and 89, and that there could have been no others. Now that we have established the agreement of Hieremias' sections with those indicated by OGR for the Veronensis, we may be allowed, on Hieremias' authority, to select 69 and 72 as the beginnings of sections, and to reject 68, 80, and 89. It is to be noted that the argument is based on the numbers which Hieremias indubitably assigned to the *capitula*, according to the evidence of the MSS, and that in no case has emendation been resorted to.

Two possible objections to the explanation given must be anticipated. In a Verona florilegium of 1329 we find the phrase *Catullus ad Varum* followed by a quotation of 22. 19-21. This quotation was no doubt taken from the "lost Verona" MS. Since in G also we find the title *Ad Varum* (in the margin by G<sup>2</sup>) it has been generally assumed that this title existed in the Veronensis. But in R the second hand first wrote *Ad suffenum* in the margin; later he deleted the second word and replaced it by *Varum*. This is the form which he used for his colored title. Professor Hale has shown that G<sup>2</sup> corrected G on M, while the latter is a copy of R as corrected by R<sup>2</sup>. Therefore if the Veronensis had any title here, it must have been that which R<sup>2</sup> originally wrote, *Ad suffenum*, not *Ad Varum*. I have no hesitation in saying that it had neither. The author of the *Flores* had no difficulty in making up his title from the first line, possibly following the analogy of the title which he found

for 8, *ad se ipsum*. In the same way R<sup>2</sup> arrived at his title—after being misled into making it *Ad suffenum*, by the first word of the poem, which is *Suffenus*. The other possible objection is similar. Bencius Alexandrinus<sup>1</sup> introduces a quotation of 35. 1–4 with the words “Catullus poeta Veronensis ad amicum Aurelium scribens.” As poem 35 is not addressed to Aurelius, Sabbadini was at a loss to explain the words. But if we look at O, we see that there is no break at 35 and that the first preceding break is at 21, which is addressed to Aurelius, as can readily be seen from the first word, the vocative *Aureli*. R<sup>2</sup> and G<sup>2</sup> give titles *Ad Aurelium*, but I do not believe that these go back to the Veronensis. Bencius, like the author of the *Flores*, invented the title.<sup>2</sup>

We may make here another comment on Bencius’ quotation. In quoting 35. 2 he gives the reading *occilio*. This is the reading of O alone. Bencius could not have used O which was written at least a generation after his time. The other MSS give *cecilio*, which is the right reading. O’s reading, then, is not an error on his part but is derived from the Veronensis. The reading *cecilio* must be an emendation,<sup>3</sup> perhaps from vs. 18, where the name occurs again, though corrupted in the MSS to *cecilia*. I mention this here to illustrate O’s striking trustworthiness, thus supporting my case as just presented. If we had not the evidence of Bencius, no one would hesitate to say that the Veronensis had *cecilio*, not *occilio*.

Further evidence of O’s being in many ways the most faithful descendant of the Veronensis that we have is presented by an examination of the Hieremias quotations as I restore them from the MSS. The form *nec* in 22. 18 which Hieremias surely wrote is the reading of O as against the *neque* of GR and the editors. I believe that O has the reading of the Veronensis. In 64. 145 Hieremias seems to have had *p<sup>g</sup>estit*, as in O. The abbreviation probably was meant for *pregestit*, but in O should be taken as *postgestit*, which GR originally had. In the same line O has *adipisci p<sup>adipisci</sup>*, which the Veronensis probably had in the same form, since G originally had

<sup>1</sup> Sabbadini *loc. cit.* Bencius certainly used the Veronensis.

<sup>2</sup> See also, in the present number of this *Journal*, Hale’s fuller discussion of Bencius’ citation, in the article “Benzo of Alexandria and Catullus,” which is based upon an argument of the same nature.

<sup>3</sup> I do not believe that the Veronensis had a double reading.

*adipisci*, while R has *apisci*. Hieremias seems to have had *apisci* al' *adipisci*. Only a reading very similar to O's will account for the readings of GR and Hieremias. In the same way in 60. 5 the *conteptam* of R and the *contentam* of G (corrected by G<sup>2</sup> to *conteptam*) are best explained by assuming a reading like O's (*contentam*) for the Veronensis and the archetype of GR (the caret perhaps being omitted in the latter).

The form *Catulus* which Hieremias used is probably not a slip on his part. Perhaps the Veronensis did not have a book-heading at the time when Hieremias examined it or got his copy from it. O has none by the first hand. It is to be noticed that Hieremias is the only one of his period, except the compiler of the Verona *Flores*, to mention Catullus without adding *Veronensis* or *poeta Veronensis*.<sup>1</sup> This designation seems to have come into the Verona MS as a book-heading with the epigram of Benevenuto de Campesanis (cf. the title of this poem in G:—*Catulli poete Veronensis*). If Hieremias examined the Verona MS before it had a heading he would have had to look into the poems themselves for the name of the author. O in the majority of cases where the name occurs in the poems has the form *Catullus*, but in the first three cases (6. 1; 7. 10; 8. 1) has the single *l*. The last case is particularly striking. It is in the first line of the poem which, as has been shown above, was introduced by the title *ad se ipsum* in the Veronensis. If in our faith in O we can trust it to have reproduced here the spelling of the Veronensis, we can easily understand how Hieremias came to use the form *Catulus*. In turning over the first few pages of the MS his attention would immediately be attracted to the title *ad se ipsum* and the vocative *Catule* in the first line of 8.

The surprising faithfulness of O as shown in one case by the evidence of Bencius and in a number of cases by that of Hieremias is of considerable importance for any attempt to reconstruct the "lost Verona" MS of Catullus. This task is made much more difficult

<sup>1</sup> So Bencius, Petrarch, Pastrengicus. This, of course, applies only to those who speak of Catullus in such a way that it is evident that they read some of his poems. It is significant that in the two places in which Pastrengicus' mention of Catullus is certainly the result of an examination of a MS of that poet he uses the expression *Veronensis poeta*, while in the two quotations of Catullus which are drawn from Pliny and Isidore simply the name of the author is given.

in that we can not be sure that an apparently correct reading of GR (such as *cecilio*), differing from O, existed in the Veronensis. In other words, the value of O is not equivalent to the combined value of G and R but is greater than it. There may be dozens of cases like *occilio* and *nec*.

The following are the MSS of the *Compendium* that I have examined:

B<sub>1</sub> = Bodleian Canon. Miscell. 186, s. XV

B<sub>2</sub> = Bodleian Canon. Lat. 212, s. XV (omits the Catullus passages)

C = Casanatense (Rome) 312 (C. IV. 11) dated 1398 (omits the last two citations)

Cm = Cambridge Univ. Library E e II. 29, s. XV

E = Escorial II h 11, dated 1402

M = Madrid H. h. 21, s. XIV-XV<sup>1</sup>

Mn = Munich 14317, s. XV

N = Naples, Naz. VII. E 2, s. XV

New = New College, Oxford (Bodleian), 100, s. XV<sup>2</sup>

P<sub>1</sub> = Paris lat. 6469, ca. 1475 (omits 39, 16)

P<sub>2</sub> = Paris N. a. l. 1779, dated 1475 (omits 51, 15, 16)

R = Reginensis (Vatican) 1526, s. XIV (?)

V<sub>1</sub> = Vatican lat. 4278, s. XIV (?)

V<sub>2</sub> = Vatican lat. 1168, s. XIV (?) (fragmentary; ends IV. 3. 3, omitting the last four Catullus quotations)

Ven = Venice edition, 1505.

I take from Ellis<sup>3</sup> readings from:

Br = British Museum 22, 801, s. XV.

From Peiper<sup>4</sup> I take readings from:

Vra = Breslau I F 129

Vrb = " I F 246

Vrc = " IV F 50.

<sup>1</sup> My notes on this MS are incomplete; they fail to report on the second and seventh passages.

<sup>2</sup> Ellis (*Catullus in the XIVth Century*, p. 9) says that this MS is dated 1400. That date is found at the end but seems rather to refer to the composition of the sermon to which it is appended.

<sup>3</sup> *Catullus* (1878), *Proleg.*, p. x. Neither Ellis nor Peiper is absolutely trustworthy. Their silence, especially, cannot be trusted. Ignorance of this fact led Wheeler astray.

<sup>4</sup> *Loc. cit.*

Rajna<sup>1</sup> mentions the following MSS not examined by me:

Florence, Laur. Gadd. Rel. 46

Florence, Riccard. 250

Florence, Riccard. 816

Florence, Magliab. Palch. IV, cod. 128, fol. 121 (containing only the Italian proverbs)

Venice, Marc. Lat. Cl. VI, 100<sup>2</sup>

Modena, Est. XII, K, 12

Valladolid (Carini *Gli Arch. e le Bibl. di Spagna*, Palermo (1884), I, 269)

Trotti collection (now dispersed; see Novati in *Giorn. Stor. d. Lett. It.* IX, 147)

Padua, Antoniana (Tomasini *Bibl. Patav.* MS, p. 56; the MS has now disappeared)

Milan, Ambros. P. 29 sup. (the work is there attributed to a certain Giovanni de Giapanis [Grapanis], but it is taken bodily from Hieremias).

Other MSS known to me are:

Leipzig, Karl W. Hiersemann (*Manuscripte des Mittelalters u. späteren Zeit*, 1906), No. 61, dated 1876(?)

Darmstadt, dated 1410 (Osann *Vitalis Blesensis Amphitryon et Aulularia*, p. vii, cited by Peiper, *op. cit.*).

The text of the quotations from Catullus is now given. No attempt at a complete critical apparatus is made, since no critical examination and comparison of the MSS was undertaken. Perhaps there are better MSS extant than any of those used, perhaps even Hieremias' own copy still exists. It seems, however, that the text of the Catullus quotations can safely be restored from the MSS listed. The oldest of my MSS seem to be the best: the Casanatensis, the two Vaticani, the Matritensis, the Escorialensis. I report only such readings as are of interest for my purpose. It is to be remembered that the text has strong MS support where no readings are given. Several facts can conveniently be grouped together at the outset.

Catulus is found in 63 cases in my MSS

" " " " 15 " " Peiper's MSS

" " " " 4 " " Br, according to Ellis

Catullus " " " " 6 " " my MSS (4 in P<sub>1</sub>, 2 in E)

" " " " 6 " " Ven

" " " " 2 " " Br, according to Ellis.

<sup>1</sup> *Loc. cit.*

<sup>2</sup> Valentinelli *Bibliotheca Manuscripta ad S. Marci Venetiarum* IV (1871), p. 188, says that this MS was written by Hieremias himself, but Rajna (p. 198, n. 3) emphatically denies this.

c. is found in 51 cases in my MSS  
 c. " " " 5 " " Ven  
 c. " " " 18 " " Peiper's MSS  
 c. " " " 6 " " Br, according to Ellis  
 c<sup>o</sup>. " " " 8 " " my MSS (5 in C, 3 in V<sub>2</sub>)  
 ea. " " " 2 " " B<sub>1</sub>  
 ea<sup>o</sup>. " " " 13 " " my MSS (6 in Mn, 7 in V<sub>1</sub>)  
 capitulo " " " 1 case " Ven.

I. or li. is found in 6 cases in my MSS (1 in New, 1 in Cm, 1 in Mn, 2 in R, 1 in M; 4 of these are in the third quotation and probably point to a common archetype for some of the MSS in which they occur)

I' is found in 1 case in Ven (first quotation)

li. is found in 1 case in Br (first quotation), according to Ellis.

I. 3. 8      Catulus c. V. Omnes fallimur nec est quisquam quem  
 (Cat. 22. 18-20) non in aliqua re videre suffenum possis suus cuique attributus est error.

V C V<sub>1</sub> V<sub>2</sub> E N New Cm B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> Mn Br  
 5 M R P<sub>1</sub> Ven  
 7 Vra Vrb Vrc<sup>1</sup>  
 nec C V<sub>1</sub> V<sub>2</sub> M E N New Cm B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>1</sub> Mn Vra Vrb Vrc  
 neque R P<sub>2</sub> Ven.

II. 1. 5      Catulus c. IX. Ne nimium simus stultorum more molesti.  
 (Cat. 68. 137)

IX C V<sub>2</sub> E New Cm P<sub>2</sub>  
 VIIII V<sub>1</sub> N B<sub>1</sub> Mn  
 9 R P<sub>1</sub> Ven Br Vra  
 nono Vrb Vrc.

III. 4. 8      Catulus c. V. Ociem et reges prius et beatas perdidit  
 (Cat. 51. 15, 16) urbes.

V C V<sub>1</sub> V<sub>2</sub> E N New Cm B<sub>1</sub> Mn  
 5 M R P<sub>1</sub> Ven Br.

IV. 4. 8      Catulus c. V. Risu inepto res ineptior nulla est.  
 (Cat. 39. 16)

V C E N New Cm B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> Mn  
 5 V<sub>1</sub> M R Ven Br  
 7 Vra Vrb Vrc<sup>2</sup>.

IV. 5. 11      Catulus c. VIII. Nulla viro iuranti femina credat  
 (Cat. 64. 143-48) Nulla viri speret sermones esse fideles  
 Quis dum aliquid cupiens animus p<sup>2</sup>gestit apisci <sup>al' adipisci</sup>  
 Nil metuunt iurare nil promittere parcunt  
 Set simul ac cupide mentis saciata libido est  
 Dicta nichil metuere nichil periuria curant.

<sup>1</sup> Peiper probably misread his MSS.    <sup>2</sup> Peiper probably again misread the MSS.

VIII C E N New Cm B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> Mn  
 8 V<sub>1</sub> M R P<sub>1</sub> Ven Br Vra Vrb Vrc  
 p̄gescit E  
 p̄gessit New B<sub>1</sub> Mn Ven  
 pregescit Br Vra Vrb  
 p̄grescit R  
 p̄gressit M N  
 p̄grossit Vrc  
 pregressit P<sub>2</sub>  
 pigrescit C V<sub>1</sub> Cm  
 pegre scit P<sub>1</sub>  
 aspici. al' adipisti (*in text*) M  
 apisci V<sub>1</sub> P<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> Br  
 apisti N  
 aspici R Vra Vrb Vrc  
 adipisci C Ven  
 ipsi E New Cm Mn<sup>1</sup>  
 et ipsi B<sub>1</sub>.

(Cat. 76. 13) Idem c. XI et pe. Difficile est longum subito depo-  
 nere amore.

XI E New Cm B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> Mn  
 11 V<sub>1</sub> M R P<sub>1</sub> Ven (*Ven has Arabic 11, not*  
*Roman II, as Ellis gives*) Vrc  
 .. (*sic*) N  
 12 Br Vra Vrb  
 et pe. N New Cm B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>1</sub> Mn Ven  
 et plt' M P<sub>2</sub> Vrc  
 et ple' R  
 et pult' Vra Vrb  
 et penl't V<sub>1</sub>  
 et pēult' E  
 om. Br (?).

IV. 6. 3 Catulus poeta c. IX. Est ne novis nuptis odio venus  
 (Cat. 66. 15, 16) atque parentum frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis.

IX E B<sub>1</sub> P<sub>2</sub> Mn  
 VIII N  
 9 V<sub>1</sub> R P<sub>1</sub> Ven Br Vra Vrb Vrc  
 4 New Cm.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

<sup>1</sup> In these four MSS, and in these only, *animus* (abbreviated) follows the reading  
 for *pregescit* instead of preceding it.

## A GREEK ANALOGUE OF THE ROMANCE ADVERB

BY PAUL SHOREY

The original suggestion of this paper was merely the observation of an interesting coincidence. The origin of the romance adverb in the instrumental ablative of *mens* with an adjective is familiar to every school boy. *Laeta mente*, Catull. 64. 237, is *lietamente*; *constanti mente*, *ibid.* 210, 239, is *constamment*. *Sagaci mente*, Lucretius 1. 1022, is, or rather might be, Italian *sagacemente*, French *sagacement*; *obstinata mente*, Catull. 8. 11, is *obstinément*, *ostinatamente*; *liquida mente*, 63. 46, is, or rather might be, *liquidement*, Italian *liquidamente*; *mente maligna*, 68. 37, is *malignement*; *perversa mente*, Commodian 1. 26. 24, is *perversement*; *fera mente*, *ibid.* 1. 28. 4, is *fièrement*; *profana mente*, Apuleius *Met.* 11. 5. 27, is, or might be, *profanement*, Italian *profanamente*; *devota mente*, Claudian 21. 232, is *dévote-ment*; *pura mente*, *ibid.* 28. 608, is *purement*; *integra mente*, Lactantius 6. 1. 2, is *entièrement*. Tacitus *Annals* 4. 22. 3 has *turbata mente*. With *memori mente*, Lucret. 3. 859, Hor. *Sat.* 2. 6. 31, Manil. 2. 862, cf. *memoriter*. Apuleius *Met.* 1. 6. 24 has *dubia mente*, 11. 6. 15 *penita mente*. Quintus Curtius 8. 3. 7 opposes with invidious antithesis *fida mente* and the adverb *muliebriter*.

I should not have thought it necessary to cite even these random instances if, after my attention had been called to the matter by the comparative frequency of the idiom in Catullus,<sup>1</sup> I had not discovered, to my surprise, that neither romance scholars nor students of vulgar Latin have collected the examples in Latin literature of a construction so important for later developments.

<sup>1</sup> 8. 11, *obstinata mente*; 62. 14, *tota mente*; 62. 40, *tacita mente*; 63. 46, *liquida mente*; 64. 71, *perdita mente*; 201, *quali mente*; 202, *tali mente*; 210 and 239, *constanti mente*; 248, *mente immemori*; 255, *lymphata mente*; 68. 37, *mente maligna*; cf. also, 64. 95, *immiti corde*; 100, *languenti corde*; 124, *immemori pectore*; 125, *ardenti corde*; 221, *laetanti pectore*; 295, *sollerti corde*; 116. 1, *studioso animo*, where *studioso* has been conjectured; I am, of course, aware that in some of these instances the ablative is not strictly speaking modal.

The romance grammars, of course, all mention it. But I find nothing that goes much beyond the brief account in Nyrop *Grammaire Historique de la Langue Française*, Vol. III, pp. 292, 603: ". . . . a son point de départ dans des expressions telles que *forti mente* (Ovide), *bona mente factum* . . . . (Quintilien), *qui religionem devota mente suscepit* (LeBlant *Inscriptions religieuses de la Gaule*, No. 436), *concupiscit iniqua mente* (Grégoire de Tours)." "Sur le modèle de ces formules," he continues, we find *brevi mente*, *rapida mente*, and finally *récemment, nouvellement, dernièrement*."

There is need of a monograph on the subject which should include similar uses of *corde*, *animo*, *ratione*, *pede*, *manu*, *modo*, *modis*, etc. Meanwhile my colleague, Professor Beeson, gives me the examples cited below from later writers.<sup>1</sup>

This paper, however, is concerned not with Latin but with Greek. Scholars do not appear to have noticed, or to have

<sup>1</sup> I quote them without delaying to distinguish the cases in which *mente* retains all or much of its meaning, or even is construed as a locative. In a special study of the subject they would be retained but classed apart:

Apuleius *De Plat. et eius dogm.* ii. 24: "sic enim fiet, ut omnes una mente sint iniquumque sibi factum nolint;" *Florido* xx: "ita ut contra in maleficiis etiam cogitata scelera, non perfecta adhuc, vindicantur, cruenta mente, pura manu;" *Met.* i. 6. 24: "hunc talem quanquam necessarium et summa cognitum, tamen dubia mente proprius accessi;" v. 23. 19: "sed dum bono tanto percita saucia mente fluctuat, lucerna illa . . . evomuit;" xi. 5. 27: "id sacrum nec sollicita nec profana mente debebis opperiri;" xi. 6. 15: "plane memineris et penita mente conditum semper tenebis mihi reliqua vitae curricula ad usque terminos ultimi spiritus vadata."

Arnobius *Adv. nat.* ii. 60: "ad dominum rerum tota mente atque animo proficisci."

Ausonius *Ep.* 14. 10:

"Set quae facunda de pectore Clementini  
Inspirant vacuos aliena mente poetas."

Cassiodorus *Varia* iii. 31. 5: "adhibete nunc studia, praestate solacia, ut inquisitionem, quam debueratis petere, grata videamini mente complere;" iv. 20. 2: "Sed quia nos ut nullum volumus fraudibus suis, praesertim cum in dispendio pauperum detestabili mente versetur . . . . decernimus ut," etc.; v. 1. 3: "ut haec inter nos grata mente facientes;" v. 13. 1: "Studium vestrum rei publicae grata mente debetis impendere quia," etc.; v. 44. 3: "sincerem purgationem pura mente suscepimus;" vii. 35. 2: "Hinc est quod veniendi tibi ad comitatum fiduciam grata mente largimur ne," etc.; x. 14. 1: "Licet vobis sit insitum dominos vestros pura mente diligere;" x. 15. 1: "qui vobiscum sincera mente colloquitur;" x. 18. 1: "Remedium, quod pro vobis, patres conscripti, pia mente tractavimus;" xi. 3. 1: "qui auctorem rerum illuminata mente conspicit;" xi. 28: "Iuvat bene meritorum votis beneficiis respondere vicaris, ut devotiore mente possit obsequi, qui meruit anteferri;" xii. 2. 5: "ut tributa inductionis tertiae decimae devota mente persolvat;" xii. 16. 2: "debitum

thought it worth while to mention, that in the periphrastic diction of Greek tragedy a similar use of the instrumental or modal dative *φρενί* became almost a formula, though it could not give rise to a new form. In Aesch. *Choeph.* 772: *γηθούσῃ φρενί*, corresponding to *ἀδειμάντως* in 771, is virtually *laeta mente* or *lietamente*. In *Choeph.* 303: *Τρόλας ἀναστατῆρας εὐδόξῳ φρενί*, the dative phrase means simply *gloriosa mente*, *glorieusement*. In Eurip. *Alcest.* 775: *εὐπροσηγόρῳ φρενί* is *εὐπροσηγόρως* (Dionys. *Hal.*) = *affabili mente*, which I presume will be found with search = *affablement*. In Aesch. *Persae* 374: *πειθάρχῳ φρενί* × *ἀκόσμως*

siquidem quod non potest evitari, prona debet mente semper offerri;" i. 1. 6: "Quapropter salutationis honorificentiam praeferentes prona mente deposcimus ne," etc.

*Carmina Epigraphica* 301. 1 ff.:

"Constantina deum venerans Christoque dicata  
Omnibus impensis devota mente paratis  
Numine divino multum Christoque iuvante  
Sacrae templum," etc.;

653. 1 ff.: "Cara pia coniux Yguia deditaque marito,  
Funeris tui causa tota nos mente dolemus;"

750. 7: "Tu tamen hinc spera caelum pia mente, fidelis."

Codex Theodosianus xvi. 8. 18: "Judeos . . . sanctae crucis adsimulatam speciem in contemptum Christianae fidei sacrilega mente exurere provinciarum rectores prohibeant."

Claudianus *Car.* xxi. 232:

"Ultro quin etiam devota mente tuerunt  
Victorique favent;"

xxii. 142: "Quis cernere curis  
Te vacuum potuit? quis tota mente remissum  
Aut indulgentem dapibus, ni causa iuberet  
Laetitiae;"

xxviii. 607: "meritis offertur inemptus  
Pura mente favor."

Commodianus *Instr.* i. 21. 2:

"Obscurati malo aliena mente iurantes;"

i. 26. 24: "Gens et ego fui perversa mente moratus;"

i. 28. 4: "Tollit se in parte et fera mente moratur."

Corippus *Joh.* iii. 379:

"Justitiam nullus compuncta mente secutus;"

iv. 266: "At pater exsurgens compuncta mente Johannes,  
Corde pio, genibus nixis et poplite flexo,  
Suppliciter gemmas tendens cum lumine palmas,  
Ore canens haec verba refert;"

viii. 156: "Has inter voces auctores criminis insonis  
Turba trahit, vinctosque duci pro crimine tanto  
Tradidit, et culpam devota mente piavit;"

viii. 162: "devota mente fatentur  
Nunc hilares socii dictis parere iubentis;"

is *oboedienter*, Italian *ubbidente*, and I dare say *πειθάρχως* exists though not in the lexicons. In Aesch. *Suppl.* 775: *εὐγλώσσῳ φρενὶ* is Italian *facondamente*; in *Choeph.* 565: *φαιδρῷ φρενὶ* is *giocondamente* or *allegramente*; *Ἴλεῳ φρενὶ*, Soph. *Trach.* 763, is *graziosamente*. In Soph. *frag.* 579, *παιξούσῃ φρενὶ* is *giocosamente*. *Ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ*, Ar. *Aves* 1376, and *ἀταρβεῖ φρενὶ*, Pind. *Pyth.* V. 51, are *intrepidamente* (cf. *trepida mente*, Lucan 4. 701); *ἀγυμνάστῳ φρενὶ*, Eurip. *frag.* 598, is *ἀγυμνάστως*, and might be *inesercitamente*; *πικνῷ φρενὶ*, Eurip. *I. A.* 67, Ar. *Acharn.* 445, is *πικνῶς* (cf. *astutamente*). In Aesch. *Sept.* 1034: *συγγόνῳ φρενὶ* has no *συγγόνως* to match it, but is exactly paralleled by the use of *έγγενῷ* in Soph. *O. T.* 1225. Compare further Aesch. *Ag.* 895: *ἀπενθήτῳ φρενὶ*; *Sept.* 484 *μαινομένῳ φρενὶ* (lyric); *Eumen.* 986: *μᾶλι φρενὶ* (*una mente, supra*, p. 84, n. 1); 275: *δελτογράφῳ φρενὶ*; 489: *ἐκδίκοις φρεσὶν*; Soph. *Trach.* 103: *ποθουμένᾳ φρενὶ* (lyric); 293: *παδίκῳ φρενὶ*; 264: *ἀτηρῷ*

*In laud. Justini* iii. 406:

“Quaeque suis aptata locis, rerumque favorem,  
In quantum potis est, devota mente notabo.”

*Dracontius Romulea* viii. 104-6:

“Verba fides pietas quatiunt mox corda parentum  
Admissumque nefas generosa mente fatetur  
Fusus in ora rubor;”

*De laud. dei* iii. 577:

“Sacrilega quasi mente putem non omnia nosse  
Aut aliquid nescire deum,” etc.;

vii. 113: “Unus [i. e. pontifex] erat Latialis mysticus aulae  
Alter apud Danaos sacra tamen mente dicatus.”

vii. 123: “Quod licet exiguum tamen inter iuri poetam  
Temnitis immemores facunda mente periti;”

*Orestes* 232: “Dum commune nefas aequali mente fruuntur (Egistus et Clytaemestra);”

*Carm. xiv.* 27:

“haec taediosa mente dum recogito.”

*Fortunatus Car.* ii. 16. 41:

“Nec tetigit mustum, sed iniqua mente rotatur:  
Antea quam biberet, ebria turba iacet.”

Lex Salica (Hessels & Kern) xvi: “Si quis uxorem alienam vivo marito tulerit, malb. abtica: et in alia mente, arba theus en lanthamo, VIII M den. qui fac. sol. CC culp. iud. ;” xxiii: “Si quis caballum alienum extra consilium domini sui ascenserit aut cabalicaverit, mal leodardo in alia m̄te borio sito sol XXXV culp. iud.”

in alia mente is explained as = Fr. autrement.

Quintus Curtius viii. 3. 7: “At illa purgare se, quod, quae utilia esse censebat, muliebriter forsitan, sed fida tamen mente suasisset;” viii. 5. 5: “Iamque omnibus praeparatis, quod olim prava mente conceperat, tunc esse maturum (ratus).

*φρενί* (lyric). To these may be added cases in which a virtual synonym is substituted, e. g., *τλάμονι ψύχᾳ*, Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 48; *μάλα ἀδόντι νόφ*, 6. 51; *εὐσεβεῖ γνώμᾳ*, O. 3. 41; *ἀσεβεῖ διανοίᾳ*, Aesch. *Sept.* 831; *αέκοντι νόφ*, Apoll. *Rhod.* 2. 769; *ἀναιδήτῳ ἴστητι*, *ibid.* 4. 360; *γαλαθηνῷ δὲ ἥθει*, Simon. fr. 22; *πρόφρονι καρδίᾳ*, Aesch. *Suppl.* 348; *έκονση καρδίᾳ*, Ar. *Eq.* 1269; *ἀτρέστῳ καρδίᾳ*, Aesch. *Ag.* 1402; *μανεστη πραπίδι*, Eurip. *Bacch.* 999; *ἡδομένᾳ ψύχᾳ*, Eurip. *frag.* 754; and countless examples with *νόφ*, *θυμῷ*, *καρδίᾳ*, and *ψύχῃ* from Homer down.

Though especially conspicuous in tragedy, this idiom like most things goes back to Homer. It is suggested by *φρεσὶ μαινομένησι*, *Il.* 24. 114; *ὸλοιῆσι φρεσὶ*, *Il.* 1. 342; *ἰδνύσι πραπίδεσσιν*, i. e. *ἐπισταμένως*, *Il.* 18. 380, *Odyss.* 7. 92; and still more by the use of *θυμῷ* in *τετιηότι θυμῷ*, *Il.* 17. 664; *πρόφρονι θυμῷ*, 24. 140; *αέκοντι θυμῷ*, 4. 43; *τετληότι θυμῷ*, *Odyss.* 9. 434; 11. 181; *ηλέῃ θυμῷ*, i. e. *ηηλέως*, *Odyss.* 9. 272, 287, 368; *ἀεσίφρονι θυμῷ*, 21. 302. Hes. *Theog.* 661 has *ἀτενεῖ τε νόφ καὶ ἐπίφρονι βούλῃ*; Theognis 199, *φιλοκέρδει θυμῷ*; 1125, *ηηλέῃ θυμῷ*; 1325, *εὐφρονι θυμῷ* (cf. *εὐφρόνως*, Pind. *Pyth.* 10. 40). In the Attic *Scolia* ἀδόλῳ φρενὶ occurs in (5), but ἀδόλῳ in (6), largely *metri causa*. Pindar has *ορθῷ φρενί*, O. 8. 24; *ἐλευθερῷ φρενί*, *Pyth.* 2. 57; *μαινομέναις φρασὶν*, *Pyth.* 2. 26; *ἀταρβεῖ φρενί*, *Pyth.* 5. 51; *χθονίᾳ φρενί*, 5. 101; *βροτεῷ φρενί*, *frag.* 61 (33). And with substitution of synonyms *ἀλαθεῖ νόφ*, O. 2. 101; *εὐμενεῖ νόφ*, *Pyth.* 8. 18; *έκόντι νόφ*, *Pyth.* 5. 43 and 8. 67; *ἀτελεῖ νόφ*, *Nem.* 3. 42; *νόφ ἀτενεῖ*, *Nem.* 7. 88; *εὐσεβεῖ γνώμᾳ*, O. 3. 41; *καθαρῷ γνώμᾳ*, O. 4. 16; *καρδίᾳ γελανεῖ*, O. 5. 2; *θυμῷ γελανεῖ*, *Pyth.* 4. 181; *ἀμόχθῳ καρδίᾳ*, *Nem.* 10. 30; *τλάμονι ψύχᾳ*, *Pyth.* 1. 48; *μάλα ἀδόντι νόφ*, *Pyth.* 6. 51.

These examples are more than sufficient to illustrate the mere coincidence. But the whole question of the relation of these and similar modal datives to the adverb requires further discussion. Brugmann says that adverbs are mostly recognizable as "erstarrte" nominal or pronominal cases, or "erstarrte" syntactic word complexes in which the main component is a noun or a pronoun. This is perhaps a formally true account of the older Greek and Indo-European adverb. It ignores the romance

adverb and the idiom here considered in which the noun is not the predominant component, but is merely used to carry the adjective or participle which it virtually converts into an adverb.

Primitive man possesses and requires but few adverbs of manner. "The want of adverbs in the *Iliad*," says Coleridge (*Table Talk*), "is very characteristic. With more adverbs there would have been some subjectivity, or subjectivity would have made them." On this hint, my student, Mr. C. E. Vance, has undertaken a study of the Greek adverb, in part statistical, in part lexicographical and stylistic. His collections already verify the presumption that Isocrates, most self-conscious of writers, would make nearly, if not quite, the largest use of adverbs and adverbial phrases. The function of the adverb may obviously be assumed by prepositional phrases, which multiply with the development of the language,<sup>1</sup> by the "internal" accusative, and by the modal datives considered in this paper.

The wide adverbial range of the "inner" accusative is touched upon by Kähner-Gerth, § 410, and Monro *Homeric Grammar*, p. 129. They mention accusative formations such as ἄκην, ἄδην, λίην, etc., the adverbial use of the neuter adjective, singular and plural, and many adverbially used cognates. What we have to note here is that in ἀπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν the noun merely serves to carry the adverbial force of the adjective, precisely as in the datives to be considered. So νοσῶ νόσον χαλεπήν is virtually χαλεπῶς, and in Aesch. *Prom.* 97 οὐ σμικρὸν νόσον is μεγάλως. In *Odyss.* 3. 316, τηνσίην ὄδὸν ἐλθῆς, the accusative is equivalent to a later τηνσίως. In *Il.* 3. 417, κακὸν οἴτον ὅληαι, and *Il.* 24. 735, λυγρὸν δλεθρον, the adverbial force of the accusative is obvious. In *Odyss.* 9. 303, ἀπωλόμεθ' αἰπὺν δλεθρον might be expressed by the later ἀποτόμως (cf. Soph. *O. T.* 877). The interchangeability of accusative and dative may be illustrated by Soph. *Trach.* 168, where ζῆν ἀλυπήτῳ βίῳ does not differ appreciably from an accusative, which we have in frag. 524. 4, ἥδιστον, οἷμαι, ζῷεν ἀνθρώπων βίον, and still more aptly by Aesch. *Sept.* 283, ἀντηρέτας ἐχθροῖσι τὸν μέγαν τρόπον, and *ibid.* 465, οὐ σμικρὸν τρόπον, compared with *Rhesus* 599, οὐ φαύλῳ τρόπῳ. So *Sept.*

<sup>1</sup>One of my students is writing a dissertation on this subject.

463, *βάρβαρον τρόπον*, may be compared with Eurip. *Orest.* 1507, *νόμοισι βαρβάροις*.<sup>1</sup>

The range of the adverbial dative phrase is much wider than would be indicated by the examples already given. I began with *φρενί* because of the interest of the coincidence with the romance adverb. But it is obvious that *τρόπῳ*, *χερὶ*, *ποδὶ*, *τύχῃ*, *μόρῳ*, *θράσει*, *σθένει*, *λόγῳ*, *νόμῳ*, *βίῳ*, *στόλῳ*, etc., will serve equally well. The special frequency of the usage in the Attic drama is due to several causes: (1) the tendency of developing language to multiply adverbial phrases; (2) the lack of an adverb;<sup>2</sup> or (3) the avoidance of an unpoetical adverb;<sup>3</sup> (4) the periphrastic *δύκεος* of tragic diction as created by Aeschylus and parodied by Aristophanes; and last, but not least, metrical convenience. An iambic or pyrrhic word preceded by a good mouth-filling adjective rounds out an iambic trimeter very neatly.

In the case of *τρόπῳ* the usage is glanced at by Fraccaroli *de Euripidis scribendi artificio*. Professor von Wilamowitz, in a note inserted in the second edition of his *Herakles*, says on l. 283: “*τῷ ἀναγκαίῳ τρόπῳ* sagt nicht viel mehr als *τῷ ἀναγκαίῳ, τῷ ἀνάγκη*. *Med.* 751, *μεθήσειν ἔκουσίῳ τρόπῳ*, *Hel.* 1547, *ἐκβαλόντες δάκρυα ποιητῷ τρόπῳ*, fast gleich einem *ἔκουσίῳς καὶ προσποιητῷς* . . . doch nicht ganz; die Weise in diesem ‘verstellter Weise’ wird noch als Substantiv empfunden.” Without aiming at exhaustiveness, I have collected enough examples to show that the usage deserves further consideration.

For *τρόπῳ* compare further Pind. *Nem.* 8. 14: *ἐν σὺν τρόπῳ = μόρῳ*; Aesch. *Sept.* 361: *παντὶ τρόπῳ = πάντῳ*, *ibid.* 116, both in prayer; *ποίῳ τρόπῳ* often = *πῶς*; Cho. 479: *τρόποισιν οὐ τυρρανικοῖς*; cf. 565, 771, 2; Ar. *Eccles.* 231: *ἀπλῷ τρόπῳ*; Plato *Crit.* 49A, etc., *οὐδενὶ τρόπῳ*. This may be illustrated also not only by the German “*Weise*,” but by old Spanish “*guisa*” and, as Professor Prescott reminds me, by Plautus’ frequent use of *multi(s) modis, omnibu(s) modis, miri(s) modis*, etc.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also Eurip. *Herc.* 1013, 1041. In 992 *μυδροκόπον μήμηα* has the function of one of Aristophanes’ adverbs of profession, as *έρωτωλικώτ*, *Frogs* 1386.

<sup>2</sup>E. g., in Eurip. *Orest.* 1505, *ἔτομένῳ ποδὶ = ἔτομένως*, which is not in L. & S., but doubtless exists. Cf. Aesch. *Choeph.* 535 and *Prom.* 856.

<sup>3</sup>E. g. *Hel.* 1516, *πεδοστιβῇ ποδὶ = πετῇ*.

<sup>4</sup>This use of *mente* does not seem to have been current in Plautus’ time, and *animo* is rare.

Almost any instrumental part of the body may be used in this idiom. For *χερὶ* cf. Pind. *O.* 10. 15; ὄρθῃ χερὶ; *Pyth.* 9. 11: *κουφῇ χερὶ*; *Nem.* 4. 55: *πολεμίᾳ χερὶ*; *Isth.* 7. 65: ἀφύκτῳ χερὶ; *O.* 7. 51: ἀριστοπόνοις χερσὶ; Aesch. *Suppl.* 958: δεδωμάτωμαι δ' οὐδ' ἐγὼ σμικρῷ χερὶ, i. e., on a grand scale, μεγαλεῖως; Soph. *Ajax* 230: *παραπλάκτῳ χερὶ*; *Antig.* 54: *αὐτουργῷ χερὶ* (cf. *αὐτοφόνως*, Aesch. *Suppl.* 65; *Sept.* 734, *αὐτοκτόνως*; and *αὐθέντως*, *Eust.*; Eurip. *Herc.* 839, *αὐθέντη φόνῳ*; *Orest.* 947, *αὐτόχειρι . . . σφαγῇ*); *El.* 1378, *λιπαρεῖ χερὶ* glossed by *λιπαρῶς καὶ συνεχῶς*; *Trach.* 923, *συντόνῳ χερὶ*, i. e., *συντονῶς*; *Oed. Tyr.* 140, *τοιαύτῃ χερὶ*, well rendered by Jebb "with a hand as fierce," but virtually = *ώσαύτως*; *frag.* 598. 3, *ἀγριᾳ χερὶ*; Eurip. *Medea* 612 (*Rhesus* 772), *ἀφθόνῳ . . . χερὶ*, virtually = *ἀφθόνως* (cf. ἀ. μένει, Aesch. *Ag.* 305, and ἀ. λόγῳ, Aesch. *Suppl.* 321); *Heracleid.* 102, *βιαλῷ χειρὶ = πρὸς βίαν = βιαλῶς*; *Medea* 1239, *δυσμενεστέρᾳ χερὶ*; Apoll. *Rhod.* 4. 1349 has *κουφῇ χερὶ*. Here also belong ὅλῃ χερὶ, Paroem., Vol. II, p. 192, and *Δημητρίᾳ χερὶ*, *ibid.* I. 110.<sup>1</sup>

Very frequent is *ποδὶ*. Already in Homer we have διερῷ ποδὶ φευγέμεν, *Odyss.* 9. 43, and in *Il.* 18. 599 ἐπισταμένοισι πόδεσσι = ἐπισταμένως. Cf. Pind. *Nem.* 3. 42, ἀτρεκεῖ ποδὶ; *Theog.* 815, *κρατέρῳ ποδὶ*; Aesch. *Persae* 95, *κραυτῷ ποδὶ*; *Prom.* 279, *ἔλαφρῷ ποδὶ*. In Soph. *Oed. Tyr.* 479, *μέλεος μελέῳ ποδὶ* is practically *κακὸς κακῶς*, and in *frag.* 227 ἀποπλήκτῳ ποδὶ differs little from *παραπλήκτῳ χερὶ*, *Ajax* 230, or from an adverb. In *El.* 162 εὐφρονὶ βῆματι is a mere variation. In Euripides it is very common. Cf. *Herc. Fur.* 1040 = *Hippoly.* 1243 = *Phoeniss.* 149; *Hec.* 1050; *Orest.* 136, 456, 1017, 1290, 1622; *Helen.* 868–69, 1449, 1516; *El.* 549; *Hel.* 555; *Hec.* 1039, *λαυφηρῷ ποδὶ*; *Bacchae* 1230; *Phoeniss.* 303, 834; *Rhesus* 697, ἀδειμάντῳ ποδὶ, i. e., ἀδειμάντως, Aesch. *Choeph.* 771; *frag.* 979. 3, *βραδεῖ ποδὶ*; *Alcest.* 586, *σφυρῷ κούφῳ*; *fr.* 123, *τάχει πεδίλῳ*; Fr. *Adesp.* Nauck, 227, *λαθάργῳ ποδὶ*; Aristoph. *Thesm.* 985, εὐρύθμῳ ποδὶ; *Theoc.* 2. 104, ποδὶ κούφῳ; Apoll. *Rhod.* 4. 1164, ὅλῳ ποδὶ (cf. Suidas and Paroemiograph., Vol. II, p. 557).<sup>2</sup> For other

<sup>1</sup> Latin parallels, as e. g., *sacrilega manu* or *dextra*, could doubtless be found in large numbers.

<sup>2</sup> There are doubtless many similar uses of *pede* in Latin, e. g., Catull. 63. 21, *citato pede*; 30, *properante pede*.

parts of the body, cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 9. 41, ἀγανᾶ ὁφρύ; *Nem.* 6. 59, ἐκόντι . . . νότρῳ; Eurip. *Orest.* 1317, ἡσύχῳ . . . ὅμματι; *Alcest.* 598, νοτέρῳ βλεφάρῳ. In Soph. *Oed.* *Tyr.* 1371, ὅμμασιν ποίοις βλέπων is only slightly more "plastic" than the πὼς . . . βλέπων of *Philoctet.* 110, and the indifference of the noun is illustrated by Longus' (II. 22) substitution of feet: ποίοις ποσὶν ἀπειμὶ παρὰ τὸν πατέρα . . . ἀνευ Χλόης. In Pind. *Pyth.* 11. 35, νέᾳ κεφαλῇ is therefore possible for νέᾳ κεφαλά.

Another group is composed of words for life, death, doom, fate, fortune, etc.; Soph. *Trach.* 168, ἀλυπήτῳ βίῳ; *El.* 650, ἀβλαβεῖ βίῳ; Crit. fr. 1. 17, ἀφθίτῳ . . . βίῳ; Hom. *Odyss.* 5. 70, θάνον οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ; Aesch. *Ag.* 1493, ἀσεβεῖ θανάτῳ; Semon. 1. 18, δυστήνῳ μόρῳ; Aesch. *Persae* 484, δυσκλεεστάτῳ μόρῳ; Cho. 296, παμφθάρτῳ μόρῳ; *Ag.* 1495, δολίῳ μόρῳ; Soph. *Aj.* 1059 and Neophr. fr. 3, αἰσχίστῳ μόρῳ; *Trach.* 1042, ὀκυπέτᾳ μόρῳ; Aesch. *Ag.* 1230, κακῇ τύχῃ; 1341, ἀσινεῖ δαίμονι; 1647, πρενυεῖ τύχῃ; 1165, δυσαλγεῖ τύχα; *Eumen.* 93, εὐπόμπῳ τύχῃ; Soph. *O. C.* 1585, ἀπόνῳ . . . τύχῃ (cf. 1561–63, ἐπιπόνῳ . . . μόρῳ); Eurip. *Hel.* 412, ἀνελπίστῳ τύχῃ; 1143, ἀνελπίσταις τύχαις; *Tro.* 631, εὐτυχεστέρῳ πότμῳ; *Orest.* 79, θεομενεῖ πότμῳ; *Sept.* 899, διχόφρονι πότμῳ.<sup>1</sup> Other miscellaneous examples are: Aesch. *Sept.* 26, ἀψευδεῖ τέχνῃ; Soph. *Ajax* 752, παντοίᾳ τέχνῃ; Eurip. *Alcest.* 53, δολίῳ τέχνῃ; Aesch. *Prom.* 1111, ἀσθενεῖ σοφίσματι; Aesch. *Pers.* 394, εὐψύχῳ θράσει; 831, ὑπερκόμπῳ θράσει; 744, νέῳ θράσει (νεανικῷ); 897, ἀναυδάτῳ μένει; *Suppl.* 757, ἀνιέρῳ μένει; *Ag.* 305, ἀφθόνῳ μένει; Cho. 445, ἀκάμπτῳ μένει; *Prom.* 49, δευτέρῳ λόγῳ; 46, ἀπλῷ λόγῳ (cf. 610, 975); *Suppl.* 580, ἀψυθεῖ λόγῳ; 321, ἀφθόνῳ λόγῳ; *Prom.* 505, βραχεῖ δὲ μύθῳ (cf. 641); 67, ἐγκράτει σθένει; *Adespot.* 295, ἀλκίῳ σθένει; Soph. *Ajax* 350, ὄρθῳ νόμῳ; Aesch. *Ag.* 594, γυναικείῳ νόμῳ; Xen. *Anab.* 3. 21, παμπληθεῖ στόλῳ; Pind. *Pyth.* 8. 98, ἐλευθέρῳ στόλῳ.

Interesting is the occasional substitution of an abstract noun with the genitive, e. g., Aesch. *Sept.* 671, σαφηνείᾳ λόγου; *Ag.* 1452, ἀλαθείᾳ φρένων; Eurip. *Phoeniss.* 1430, προθυμίᾳ ποδὸς. So already in *Odyss.* 2. 346 (cf. 23. 77), νόσου πολυιδρείησιν.

<sup>1</sup>Cf. Wilamowitz *Pruss. Acad.* 1908, p. 332, n. 1: "Euripides sagt oft τίνι πότμῳ wo es fast dasselbe wie τρόπῳ ist, Fall und Wendung.

Again, in many cases when an adverb is in fact used, we can see that a dative phrase would have served as well. We have already noted the interchange of ἀδόλως and ἀδόλῳ φρενί in the Attic *Scolia*; and of ἐπισταμένως and ἐπισταμένοισι (πόδεσσιν) in Homer. In *Il.* 15. 510, we have αὐτοσχέδιγ; in 746, αὐτοσχέδον, and in 17. 294, αὐτοσχέδιν. In *Odyss.* 7. 241, and Aesch. *Ag.* διηνεκέως ἀγορεῦσαι (ἀκούειν) suggests διηνεκεῖ λόγῳ (Plat. *Hipp. Maj.* 301E), which does not happen to occur in tragedy. In Semon. 7. 107, προφρόνως differs little from πρόφρονι θυμῷ in Hes. *Theog.* 586, or πρόφρονι καρδίᾳ, Aesch. *Suppl.* 348. Φρενομόρως, Soph. *Aj.* 626 = φρενώλης, Aesch. *Sept.* 757 = φρενομανής, *Ag.* 1140 = λυσσάδι μοίρᾳ, Eurip. *Herc.* 1024 = μαινομένᾳ φρενί, *Sept.* 484 = the Homeric φρεσὶ μαινομένησιν = μαινομένῃ κραδίᾳ, *Medea* 432, etc. In *Prom.* 730, θραυστπλάγχνως recalls Pindar's θρασείᾳ . . . καρδίᾳ, *Pyth.* 10. 44. In *Persae* 374, οὐκ ἀκόσμως ἀλλὰ πειθάρχῳ φρενί, adverb and phrase are, as often, co-ordinated. In Soph. *O. C.* 490, ἀστροφος = ἀστρεπτεῖ = ἀστρόφοισιν ὅμμασιν, *Choeph.* 99. Φαιδρώπως, *Ag.* 729, recalls φαιδρῷ φρενί, *Choeph.* 565. Εὐτόλμως, *Ag.* 1298, might be εὐτόλμῳ φρενί; cf. εὐτόλμου φρενὸς, 1302. And, not to multiply examples, other adverbs that suggest similar equivalents are δυσεκλύτως, *Prom.* 60; ὀμοφρόνως, *Persae* 911; δυστμόρως, *Sept.* 837 (cf. 444); δυσπότμως, *Persae* 278; οὐκ ἀφρασμόνως, *Persae* 417; παγκρότως, Aesch. *Suppl.* 723; βαρυστόνως, *Eumen.* 794; ἀκηδέστως, *Il.* 24. 417; δυσλόφως, Eurip. *Tro.* 303; εὐλόφως, fr. 175.

I do not wish to make too much of the matter. That the modal dative is in a sense adverbial is obvious. It is so without qualifying adjective. See Kühner-Gerth, Vol. I, p. 435, and Monro *Hom. Gram.*, p. 137. *Odyss.* 6. 320, νόῳ ἐπέβαλλεν ιμάσθλην; *Il.* 22. 287, κερδοσύνῃ; 13. 29, γηθοσύνῃ; *Odyss.* 15. 209, σπουδῇ; 9. 361, ἀφραδίγσι; 15. 186, βίῃ. In *Tyrt.* 8. 13, θυμῷ = bravely; in Aesch. *Prom.* 74, βίᾳ = βιαίως, and the datives φιλότητι, *Ajax* 1410; σοφίᾳ, *Antig.* 620; ἀσφαλείᾳ, *Oed. Tyr.* 51 = ἀσφαλῶς, *Antig.* 162, and εὐθυνλίᾳ, *Persae* 748, are all practically adverbs. As Plato says (*Protag.* 332 B), εἴ τι ἵσχει πράττεται ἵσχυρῶς πράττεται, καὶ εἴ τι ἀσθενείᾳ, ἀσθενῶς.

When the qualifying adjective is present and carries the main

meaning, it is always possible to argue that the apparently superfluous noun is "plastic" and helps fill out the picture. Ἐμμανέ σκιρτήματι, *Prom.* 675, is more vivid than ἐμμανῶς; ἀκοιμήτῳ ρεύματι, *ibid.* 139, is more than ἀκοιμήτως, if it existed, would be; δράσμῳ κρυφαίῳ, *Persae* 360, than κρυφαίως; ἐκόντι νώτῳ, *Pind. Nem.* 6. 59, than ἐκονίως; θολερῷ χειμῶνι, *Ajax* 206, than θολερῶς; ἀθεῷ ποδὶ, *Eumen.* 541, than ἀθέως; δυσφάτῳ κλάγγᾳ, *Ag.* 1152, than δυσφήμως; θανασίμῳ χειρώματι, *Oed. Tyr.* 560, than θανασίμως; (ξὺν) ἀσφαδάστῳ καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι, *Ajax* 833, than ἀσφαδάστως καὶ ταχέως; ἀγανᾶ . . . ὁφρύ, *Pind. Pyth.* 9. 41, than ἀγανῶς; ἀπίστῳ βραχίονι, *I. T.* 796, than even the pregnant use of ἀπίστως (cf. *Adespot.* 416).

The cases of the mere adverbial formula merge by insensible gradations into those in which the instrumental and plastic force of the noun must be pressed. The former might be augmented by all examples in which it would be possible to dispense with the noun, the latter by all in which any meaning, however pleonastic, can be assigned to it. It is simply a question of watching the habits of the language and determining the probable part of formula. That it is considerable is obvious. It matters little whether a personage proceeds with timid mind, eye, heart, hand, or foot; whether he bestows with ungrudging hand or spirit; whether he "gets there" with whole hand or foot; whether he dies by a shameful doom, fortune, destiny, or death; whether he lives a joyous life, with a joyous life, or joyously; whether the defeated flee προτροπάδην (*Il.* 16. 304), ἀκόσμῳ (ξὺν) φυγῇ (*Persae* 470), or παντρόπῳ φυγῇ (*Sept.* 953).

The chief practical outcome, apart from two or three possible emendations,<sup>1</sup> is that we should beware of overinterpreting the noun in such formulas. In Soph. *Trach.* 293, 294:

πῶς δ' οὐκ ἐγὼ χαίρομ' ἀν ἀνδρὸς εὐτυχῆ  
κλίνουσα πρᾶξιν τήνδε πανδίκῳ φρενί

<sup>1</sup> In Eurip. fr. 285. 7, 8 N., for δλβον διογων θάλαμον ηδιστον χερι we might plausibly read ηδιστρ χερι. In *Herc. Fur.* 1003, the *verba desperata* ἐτι λόφῳ κέαρ may have displaced ἐπικότῳ χερι. In Aesch. *Ag.* 1357, for οὐ καθεύδονσιν χερι it might be possible to substitute οὐ καθευδόνῃ χερι. Cf. οὐκ ἀγυμάστῳ φρενι, Eurip. fr. 598. The mixed metaphor is, of course, no objection. Λημνὶ χερι in Suidas and Zenob. *Cen.* 4. 91 is probably the close of a lost iambic.

is perhaps overtranslated by Jebb's note "with a thoroughly justified feeling." It says little more than the *πανδίκως* of 611, which with the flexibility of the Greek adverb means in *O. C.* 1306 "in my just cause," while in Aesch. *Sept.* 670, *πανδίκως ψευδώνυμος* is merely "altogether," or "entirely." Again, in the exquisite fragment of Sophocles, 579. 3 N.,

. . . . ὑπὸ στέγη  
πυκνῆς ἀκοῦσαι ψακάδος εὐδούση φρενί,

the subtleties that we feel and that the poet may have associated with the line did not determine its form. To hear the frequent patter of the rain with sleeping mind is merely Tibullus'

quam juvat immites ventos audire *cubantem*,

or Wordsworth's

"How touching, when at midnight sweep  
Snow-muffled winds and all is dark,  
To hear and sink again to sleep."

We need not raise the question of sub-consciousness. In Soph. *Ajax* 752, *παντοίᾳ τέχνῃ* is perhaps slightly overtranslated by Jebb's "all means in his power," and is certainly over-interpreted by Ellendt's "in quo astuti quidem sed non fraudulentii significatio sit." *Παντοίᾳ* is merely a variation for *πάσῃ* in a familiar idiom. Cf. Lysias 19. 53, *πάσῃ τέχνῃ καὶ μηχάνῃ ἐλεήσατε* = *πάντως*, 13. 95, 19. 11; Herod. 1. 112, 7. 51; Thucyd. 5. 18. 2; Aristoph. *Eq.* 592; *Nubes* 885, 1323; *Eccles.* 360; *Thesm.* 65, 271; *Ran.* 1235; *Lysist.* 412, 300, *πάσαις τέχναις*; Demosth. 24. 150, 56. 16. In Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 59, *χρὴ τὰ ἐουκότα παρ δαιμόνων μαστεύειν θναταῖς φρασίν*, Professor Gildersleeve, while alluding to the interpretation *modesta mente* (Dissen), prefers to construe *φρασίν* with *ἐουκότα*, as does Rumpel (*naturae suae congrua*). But, I think, the Pindaric parallels, including *Pyth.* 2. 27, *μαννομέναις φρασίν*, favor the other construction. This brings out more clearly the idea, *θνητὰ φρονεῖν* (Eurip. *Alcest.* 799), or *ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν* (Ar. *Nic. Eth.* 10. 8), where the adverbial accusative almost = *ἀνθρωπίνως* (despite its slightly different connotation). The absolute use of *ἐουκότα* is, of course, no difficulty. In Pind. *Pyth.* 9. 33, where the nymph Cyrene *ἀταρβεῖ νεῖκος*

ἀγει κεφαλᾶ, Professor Gildersleeve bids us "note the serenity of the heads of the combatants" in Greek art, and the plastic value of *κεφαλᾶ* might be further illustrated by the lines in Keats' *Lamia*:

Charioting foremost in the envious race  
Like a young Jove with calm uneager face.

But ἀδειμάντῳ ποδὶ and ἀταρβεῖ φρενὶ, *Pyth.* 9. 51, tend to reduce even this to formula.

The much-debated *χθονίᾳ φρενὶ*, *Pyth.* 5. 101, is translated by Myers "And apart from him lie other sacred kings that have their lot in Hades; and even now perchance they hear with such heed as remaineth to the dead." Fennell renders "with such faculty as the dead possess." Jebb translates "they hear I ween with the mind of the nether world," and comments: "if *χθονίᾳ φρενὶ* meant 'with such imperfect consciousness as the dead possess,' then Pindar will be speaking like the Homeric Achilles. . . . It is more in accord with Pindar's manner to regard *χθονίᾳ* as conveying a shadowy suggestion that the intelligence which belongs to the unseen world is of a different order from the intelligence of the living." This is perhaps considering the matter too curiously. Such suggestions are inevitable for us and may possibly have occurred to Pindar. But I think Professor Gildersleeve is nearer the truth when he simply glosses *χθονίᾳ* by ὑπὸ *χθονὸς*. Pindar is not concerned with either psychology or eschatology here. He is merely rounding out a line with a convenient formula. The "psychology" is that of Browning's Bishop:

And then how I shall lie through centuries,  
And *hear* the blessed mutter of the mass,  
And *see* God made and eaten all day long,  
And *feel* the steady candle flame, and *taste*  
Good, strong, thick, stupefying incense smoke.

As Lucretius says (3. 882):

. . . illum  
se fingit sensuque suo contaminat astans.

It would be easy to carry the idea of this study too far. Some of the cases cited are perhaps not strictly speaking adverbial or modal. But if allowance is made for the wider range

of the Greek adverb in the expression of attendant circumstance and in proleptic or pregnant uses,<sup>1</sup> this objection will often disappear. In Aesch. *Prom.* 861, *μικτιφρουρήτῳ θράσει* is hardly more than *nuitamment*.<sup>2</sup> Γέροντι . . . ποδί (*Orest.* 456) and γηραιῷ ποδί (*Phoeniss.* 303) are practically γεροντικῶς. So καθαρσίῳ ποδί, Soph. *Antig.* 1142, and χειρὶ παιωνίᾳ, Aesch. *Suppl.* 1067, might be illustrated by proleptic adverbs. And in this way the formula might be stretched even to take in such cases as λευσίμῳ χερί, *Orest.* 863; τυφλῷ ποδί, *Phoeniss.* 834; παλλεύκῳ ποδί, *Medea* 1165; ικεσίᾳ χερί, Eurip. *Suppl.* 108; βακχείῳ ποδί, *Bacch.* 1230; καρβάνῳ χερί, *Ag.* 1061. In Aesch. *Suppl.* 606, γηραιῷ φρενὶ is not adverbial to our feeling. But neither is παιδικῶς in Plato *Lysis* 211 A, which Liddell and Scott, misled by *Cratyl.* 406 C, accordingly misinterpret, and which Jowett is obliged to paraphrase, "in a childish (and affectionate) manner." A Greek poet might have turned it by παιδικῇ φρενὶ. But such considerations exceed the scope of this paper, which is not the maintenance of a thesis but the illustration of a somewhat neglected phraseological habit of the Greek language.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> E. g. ἀκηθέστως, *Il.* 24. 417; στυγερῶς, 16. 723; λευγαλέως, *Odyss.* 13. 723; σφαλερῶς, Eurip. *I. A.* 600; στεγανῶς, Thucyd. 4. 100.

<sup>2</sup> Nyrop cites *mille-et-une-nuitamment*.

## THE NAME "TEN THOUSAND"

BY ROBERT J. BONNER

The Greek mercenaries known to every schoolboy as the "Ten Thousand" actually numbered 12,900<sup>1</sup> when they began their famous retreat, 6,000 when they ended it in Thrace, and 5,000 when they took service under Thibron against their old foes the Persians.<sup>2</sup> Cousin<sup>3</sup> has made an effort to determine *when* the name "Ten Thousand" became current; but no one, I believe, has thought it worth while to ask *why* this name came to be used, so obvious is the explanation that ten thousand is a fair average between the extremes.

Various designations appear in contemporary literature, but nowhere is *μύριοι* alone used. Xenophon in the *Hellenica*<sup>4</sup> calls them *οι Κύρειοι*; in the *Anabasis* no special name is used. Isocrates<sup>5</sup> uses *τὸ Κύρειον στράτευμα*, *οι Κύρω συναναβάντες*, and *οι μετὰ Κύρου καὶ Κλεάρχου συστρατευσάμενοι*. Diodorus,<sup>6</sup> whose ultimate source is probably the account of Sophænetus as it appeared in the work of Ephorus, the pupil of Isocrates, refers to them as *οι ἐστρατευμένοι μετὰ Κύρου*. Apparently contemporary writers did not describe them by a number. Isocrates estimates them at six thousand, the number which reached Thrace, choosing the smaller number in order to enhance their achievement and emphasize the military inefficiency of Persia. Diodorus gives

<sup>1</sup> Xenophon (*Anab.* 1. 2. 9.) estimates the troops at 11,000 hoplites and about (δύοι) 2,000 light armed; but the sum of the different contingents, including both enumerations of Sophænetus' division, amounts to 10,600 hoplites and 2,300 light armed. On the eve of the battle of Cunaxa (*Anab.* 1. 7. 10) there were 10,400 hoplites and 2,500 light armed, although 1,000 troops (700 with Cheirisophus, 400 deserters from Abrocomas, 100 lost by Menon) were added in the meantime. See Cousin *Kyros Le Jeune en Asie Mineure* (1904), pp. 146 ff. Neubert *De Xenophontis Anabasi*, whom Cousin does not cite, regards the second mention of Sophænetus and both enumerations as interpolations. The total number at Cunaxa would be 12,900. Diodorus (xiv. 19. 6, 7) estimates the number at 13,000.

<sup>2</sup> *Anab.* vii. 7. 23; Diodorus xiv. 37. 1.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 152 ff.

<sup>4</sup> iii. 2. 7.

<sup>5</sup> *Pany.* 144, 145; *Phil.* 90.

<sup>6</sup> xiv. 37. 1. Diodorus cites Ephorus and Ctesias but shows no indication of having read the *Anabasis*. Cf. Cousin, pp. xii ff.

their numbers as thirteen thousand at Sardis, but in a later part of his account of the retreat he says, "out of ten thousand, eight thousand three hundred reached Chrysopolis in safety."<sup>1</sup> Μύρμι is not used here as a convenient designation of the army; it indicates the total number of troops. But Diodorus has already given the total as thirteen thousand at Sardis. This total was maintained approximately up to the battle of Cunaxa. It is not satisfactory to assume that Diodorus is following sources that give different totals, and carelessly uses both. It is more likely that he is dealing with estimates made at different points of the retreat. In the account of the expedition attributed by Xenophon to Themistogenes of Syracuse the retreat ended with the arrival of the army at the Pontus Euxinus.<sup>2</sup> Here at length they were in safety. That this was the feeling of the soldiers is plain from Diodorus' statement: ὡς δ' ἀπαντας ἀνέβησαν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἐξ οὐ τὴν θάλατταν ἦν ὄραν, τοῖς θεοῖς ἀνατείναντες τὰς χεῖρας ηὐχαρίστουν ὡς ἥδη διασεσωσμένοι.<sup>3</sup> This spontaneous exhibition of thankfulness was officially supplemented by thank-offerings for safety (*σωτήρια*) which they had vowed they would offer ἐνθα πρῶτον εἰς φιλίαν γῆν ἀφίκουντο.<sup>4</sup> Now, those who reached the sea amounted to ten thousand in round numbers. This is the explanation of the second total of Diodorus. Evidently the account referred to by Xenophon, whether his own or Themistogenes',<sup>5</sup> practically

<sup>1</sup> μόγις οὖν διεσώθησαν εἰς Χρυσόπολιν τῆς Χαλκηδονίας οἱ περιλειφθέντες ἀπὸ μυρίων δικαίου λιθίων τριακόσιοι, xiv. 31. 4.

<sup>2</sup> ὡς μὲν οὖν Κύρος στράτευμά τε συνέλεξε καὶ τοῦτον ἔχων ἀνέβη ἐπὶ τὸν ἀδελφόν, καὶ ὡς ἡ μάχη ἐγένετο, καὶ ὡς ἀπέθανε, καὶ ὡς ἐκ τούτουν διεσώθησαν οἱ Ἑλληνες ἐπὶ θάλατταν, Θεμιστογένει τῷ Συρακοσίω γέγραπται.—*Hellen.* iii. 1. 2.

<sup>3</sup> xiv. 29. 4. Leon of Thurium in supporting his proposal to sail to Greece says, ἐπιθυμῶ δὲ ἥδη πανσάμενος τούτων τῶν πόνων, ἐπει θάλατταν ἔχομεν, πλεῖν τὸ λοιπὸν καὶ ἐκταθεὶς ὥστερ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀρκέσθαι εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα.—*Anab.* v. 1. 2. As Cotyora is the place from which they actually sail (vi. 1. 14) some regard the retreat as ending with their arrival at that place.

<sup>4</sup> *Xen. Anabasis* v. 1. 1; cf. iii. 2. 9; iv. 8. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Most scholars accept Plutarch's view that Xenophon hoped to gain a readier credence for his exploits if his account appeared as the work of a disinterested writer. Σενοφῶν μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐντοῦ γέγονεν ἴστορια, γράψας δὲ ἐστρατήγησε καὶ κατώρθωσε καὶ Θεμιστογένει περὶ τούτων συντεάχθαι τῷ Συρακοσίῳ, ἵνα πιστότερος ἦν διηγούμενος ἐαυτὸν ὡς ἀλλον, τὴν τῶν λόγων δέξαντας χαριζόμενος.—Plutarch *Moralia* 345 E. Cousin, p. xix, argues that there really was an account by Themistogenes. For the numbers at this point see *Anab.* iv. 8. 15. There were not fewer than 9,800.

corresponded with the first four books of our *Anabasis*. Here is the source of the name "Ten Thousand." This is the number that escaped from the vengeance and treachery of the king. It is natural to suppose that Sophaenetus also made an estimate of the number that reached the sea even if his account carried the story of the army down to the Thracian campaign. Thus in the eyes of the Greek world it came to be regarded as the expedition of the Ten Thousand. Diodorus in continuing the story down to Chrysopolis implicitly adopts this as the total that began the second stage of the retreat. In Arrian<sup>1</sup> *μύριοι* appears as a distinctive designation of these troops; it is qualified by *σὺν Κύρῳ* or *άμα Ξενοφῶντι*. Some such qualification may have been necessary owing to the use of *οἱ μύριοι* to designate the Arcadian assembly.<sup>2</sup> Once the name became current it would be used as Cousin<sup>3</sup> observes, sans que l'on sache bien si c'est le nombre de ceux qui sont partis ou de ceux qui sont revenus, ou une sorte de moyenne entre ces deux nombres. It need occasion no surprise then to find that Trogus Pompeius as reported by Justinus<sup>4</sup> gives the numbers at Cunaxa as ten thousand, nor that Suidas<sup>5</sup> estimates those who reached Thrace at the same number.

Among the Romans as in modern times the name "Ten Thousand" without any qualification was current. During the stress of the Parthian campaign Antony is said to have exclaimed frequently, "ὦ μύριοι," *θαυμάζοντα τοὺς μετὰ Ξενοφῶντος, ὅτι καὶ πλείονα καταβαίνοντες ὅδον ἐκ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας καὶ πολλαπλασίους μαχόμενοι πολεμίοις ἀπεσώθησαν.*<sup>6</sup>

Francis Bacon<sup>7</sup> praises Xenophon as the young scholar who "conducted these Ten Thousand foot through the heart of all the king's high countries."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

<sup>1</sup> *Anabasis* i. 12. 3; ii. 7. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Xen. *Hellen.* vii. 1. 38. The Arcadian league was founded b. c. 371-369. Photius explains *μύριοι ἐν Μεγαλοπόλει* but says nothing of the Cyreian army.

<sup>3</sup> *Op. cit.*, p. 153.

<sup>4</sup> In eo proelio decem milia Graecorum in auxilio Cyri fuere.—Trog. Pompei *Historiarum Philippicarum Epitoma* v. 11. 10.

<sup>5</sup> S. Ξενοφῶν. ἀλθόντες δὲ καὶ εἰς Θράκην ἐμίσθωσαν ἑαυτούς Σεύθη τῷ βασιλεῖ, μύριοι διασώθεντες.

<sup>6</sup> Plutarch *Antony* 45. 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Advancement of Learning* 1. 7.

## NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

### λιπαρὰ Ἀθῆναι

Pind. Frag. 76 (46), from *Schol. Aristoph. Ach. 674*:

ὦ ταὶ λιπαρὰ καὶ ιστέφανοι καὶ δοίδμοι,  
Ἐλλάδος ἔρεισμα, κλανὰ Ἀθῆναι,  
δαιμόνιον πτολίεθρον.

Aristoph. *Ach.* 639 f.:

εἴ δέ τις ὑμᾶς ὑποθωπεύσας λιπαρὰς καλέσειν Ἀθῆνας,  
εὑρέτο πᾶν ἀνδρὶ τὰς λιπαράς.

Why did the Athenians take such pride in this compliment? What did they understand Pindar to mean by *λιπαρά*? L.S. suggest "probably with allusion to the Attic olive," and this explanation is the one usually given, though some scholars prefer to interpret *λιπαρά* as "rich." The Schol. on Aristoph. *Nub.* 299 f., as usual in difficult cases, offers a variety of explanations, but sheds no real light on the problem.

The olive was indeed one of the glories of Athens, but we may well doubt a reference here to that famous gift of Athena. No parallel usage has been cited, and in a poet of the grand style, like Pindar, we should expect a direct *mention* of the olive, rather than an almost humorous reference to its oily gloss. "Sleek Athens" is scarcely a compliment in the Pindaric vein. Moreover, Pindar uses *λιπαρός* in praising a variety of other cities and localities, which were not specially celebrated for olives. So of Thebes, Marathon, Orchomenus, Naxos, Smyrna, and even Egypt—the latter a country where the existence of olive culture has frequently been denied, though probably on insufficient ground. Cf. Hehn-Schrader *Kultur-Pflanzen und Haustiere*, pp. 117, 120. In general, Pindar's compliment, thus interpreted, would seem to be of too homely a character to account for the gratification it gave to the Athenians.

The case is even worse with the other accepted explanation, "rich." The soil of Attica was notoriously light and poor. Cf. Thuc. i. 2. 5; Lolling *Hellenische Landeskunde* 114; Milchhöfer, in Pauly-Wissowa, *s. v.* "Attika." And as for acquired wealth, the sorely devastated Athens of 475 B.C. (the approximate date of the dithyramb in which our passage occurred), could scarcely take pride in so ill-timed a compliment. The political and artistic glory of Athens, as well as her pre-eminence in literature, were still for the most part in the future. So, too, Pindar speaks (Frag. 204 [218]) of *λιπαρῷ Σμυρναῖον ἄστει*, though Smyrna was in

ruins during the poet's lifetime. Cf. O. 13. 110: *λιπαρὰ Μαραθών*, of a country deme, renowned only on patriotic grounds.

In view of these facts we must admit that another explanation is needed for *λιπαραὶ Ἀθᾶναι*. The fact that a number of different localities are honored with the same epithet seems to point to a meaning of comparatively wide application, while the serious vicissitudes, through which Athens, Thebes, Orchomenus, and Smyrna had recently passed force us to search for a glory conferred by the enduring gift of Nature, rather than one created by the hands or brain of man. We must find, then, some natural feature of Athens, shared indeed with a wide circle of Mediterranean communities, but felt to be the special attribute of the violet-crowned city. And, finally, the feature for which we seek must be one which can readily be understood as implied in the epithet *λιπαρός*—“glossy,” “shining,” “brilliant.” We are thus driven irresistibly to the conclusion that our poet had in mind the clear and resplendent *atmosphere* of Attica. Brilliant skies are characteristic of most of the countries bordering upon the eastern Mediterranean, but especially and pre-eminently of Attica, as every traveler has noticed, and as many observers, both ancient and modern, have recorded. Cf. Cic. *De fato* 4. 7; Dion Chrys. *On Royalty* 6 *ad init.*; Aristides Rhetor. *Panath.* 161; Photius *Biblioth.* 441a. 28; Wachsmuth *Stadt Athen* 93 f.; Judeich *Topographie von Athen* 47.

This meaning of *λιπαρός*, “brilliant,” “resplendent,” suits all the passages in Pindar where the word is used, whether with names of localities, or in other locutions. Cf. Frag. 30 (6), where Themis is conducted Οὐλύμπου *λιπαρὰν καθ' ὁδόν*, to be the primal spouse of Zeus. In short, when Pindar wrote the words *λιπαραὶ Ἀθᾶναι*, he meant almost precisely what the Athenian Euripides meant, when he made his chorus (*Med.* 824 ff.) sing of the children of Erechtheus:

ἀεὶ δὰ λαμπροτάτον  
βαίνοντες ἀβρῶς αἰθέρος.

EDWARD BULL CLAPP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ARISTOPHANES *CLOUDS* 1472-74

Στ. οὐκ ἔξελήλακ,<sup>7</sup> ἀλλ' ἐγώ τοῦτ' φόμην  
δὰ τουτονὶ τὸ δίνον. οἴμοι δεῖλαος  
ὅτε καὶ σὲ χντρεοῦν ὄντα θεὸν ἡγησάμην.

This passage has long defied the commentators. The difficulty is an old one as R and V have *δὰ* unaccented and a lesser Paris MS, *δία*, which approximates Bentley's subtle but unconvincing emendation, *τότ' φόμην | Δία*. This reading of Bentley's is, however, impossible, if for

no other reason, because Strepsiades had never confused Zeus and Dinos, but merely thought the former had been supplanted by the latter (cf. 381, 828, 1471). Meineke's *τοντονί* (of Socrates) is wrong, for Socrates is not present, and involves a misuse of the preposition (see S. Sobolewski *De praepositionum usu Aristophaneo* [Moscow, 1890], p. 111). The real crux is l. 1474. No satisfactory explanation of this has been given or can be given in my opinion. That a large earthenware jar (*δίνος*) was hanging outside the *φροντιστήριον* as a symbol of Dinos, or even an *ἄγαλμα Δίνον*—Schol. V—(under what conceivable shape?) is preposterously crude and stupid, and any such object must have been mentioned at 200 ff., where Strepsiades passes in review the visible apparatus. Van Leeuwen's stage direction—*subito domum intrat, unde elatum reddit vas rotundum afferens*, or Heidhues' suggestion (*Neue Philol. Rundschau* [1898], p. 387) that the old man comes bouncing out of his house with a *δίνος* in his hand at the very beginning of the quarrel (i. e., v. 1321, so that 150 verses would have to pass without any reference to it!), presupposes stage business far too clumsy and farfetched for Aristophanes. Besides in what conceivable sense could an earthenware *δίνος* be the *cause* of Strepsiades' fond imagining?

The truth is, 1474 is spurious; it bears all the earmarks of a line composed to explain a difficulty in interpretation. On any understanding of the whole passage the line is a dull and pointless explanation of a stage action which must have been perfectly clear without it. Students of Greek comedy like Meineke, Droysen, Kock, Blaydes, and in our own country Humphreys, have pronounced against the line, and it has been unhesitatingly condemned by such experts in the ways and wiles of the scholiasts as Dindorf and Rutherford. Cf. especially the latter's note: "It is a modification of some note on *οἵμοι δείλαιος*, viz. *ὅτι καὶ σε χυτρεοῦν ὄντα ἡγγράμην θεόν*, or the like." The real meaning of the passage becomes clear when we take *δίνον* as a bitter jest of the now thoroughly repentant Strepsiades on himself, referring thereby to the "vortex" or "whirl" going on in his own head during his talk with Socrates and his vain efforts to profit by his instruction. The poet has taken pains to emphasize the excited state of the old man throughout. Cf. 180 ff.; 319-21; especially 810, *ἀνδρὸς ἐκπεληγμένον καὶ φανερῶς ἐπηρμένον*, and 1457. The *τοντονί* is, of course, deictic as the scholiast says, the old man pointing significantly to his head. The passage might then be rendered roughly: "Nay, Whirl has not driven out Zeus, I only thought so for the nonce, because of the *whirl* in here (with a gesture), old fool that I was." It might be asking too much to give an exact parallel for a pun, but *δίνος* is used by Hippocrates and later medical writers for dizziness (see Erotian's Gloss. *s. v.*, and Franz's long note *ad loc.*)—quite as the Latin *vertigo*, which by the way is also applied to drunkenness, and though ordinary Greek idiom is "all knocked out," *ἐκπλιγτεσθαι*, "all in a flutter,"

*πέρισσος*, or "all up in the air," *ἐπαρπερός*, for intense excitement or surprise, nevertheless the connection of confused thought with a whirling motion is so natural (as in English we speak of one's head being "all in a whirl," "things going round and round," or remark of a crank or an enthusiast that he has "wheels in his head"), that no Greek audience can have failed to catch the point, especially when assisted by byplay like that here.

W. A. OLDFATHER

THE UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

---

PLAUTUS' TRINUMMUS 675

Lysiteles is preaching to the young lover, Lesbonicus, a sermon on the disastrous effects of love upon one's good name and fame (641 ff.). He describes *Amor* in the phrases and figures conventional in the *sermo amatorius*: Love is a *ballista* (669); Love undermines stability of character, produces discontent (669-72); in short, "insanum [et] malumst in hospitium devorti ad Cupidinem" (673). He concludes his sermon with a somewhat confused figure:

675 si istuc, ut conare, facis † indicium † tuom incendes genus;  
tum igitur tibi aquai erit cupido genus qui restinguas tuom,  
atque si eris nactus, proinde ut corde amantes sunt cati,  
ne scintillam quidem relinquas genus qui congliscat tuom.

What part in this figure is played by *facis indicium* (675)? *Facere indicium* is excellent Latin, and familiar in Plautus' diction (*Aul.* 188. 671; *Capt.* 1014; *Cist.* 678; *M. G.* 306; *Most.* 745; *Rud.* 428, 429, 959). But what point can there be in a reference to a public announcement? The verse does not refer to the betrothal of Lesbonicus' sister and Lysiteles, but is simply part of a sermon on the evil effects of love as they are likely to be exemplified in Lesbonicus' excesses. Clearly, conservative modern editors (Leo, Lindsay, and others) are quite right in marking *indicium* corrupt, and Niemeyer is unsuccessful in trying to make sense of the MSS reading.

Nitzsch (*Rh. Mus.* XII [1857] 136) emended so as to read:

si istuc, ut conare, facis, incendio incendes genus.

But *genus . . . tuom* in 676 and 678 prevents the excision of *tuom* in 675 (cf. Brix-Niemeyer *Anhang* on 675). Others have attempted bolder changes (e. g., Bergk *Kl. Schr.* I. 104, 109) with even less success. Lambinus, however, proposed a simple remedy, following, as he says, "nostros libros veteres . . . in quibus scriptum est *incidium*. Quodsi nulli codices me adiuvarent, tamen me ipsa ratio facile ad hanc conjecturam

veluti manu duceret. Nam cum sequitur 'tuom incendes genus' haec ipsa verba indicant incendii mentionem antecessisse." His reading is:

si istuc, ut conare, facis incendium, tuom incendes genus.

If this reading of the *libri veteres Lambini* is authentic, the history of the corruption is clear: *incendium* (Plautus) > *incidium* (cod. Turnebi, as Lindsay suggests with an interrogation mark) > *indicium* (P).

But neither Lambinus nor any other editor seems to have noted that two other passages of Plautus confirm Lambinus' reading, and one of them is in a play from a Greek original of Philemon, the author of the *Θησαυρός*, from which Plautus took his *Trinummus*:

*ex amore* tantum est homini *incendium*: *Asin.* 919.

ita mi in pectore atque in corde *facit amor incendium*: *Merc.* 590.

These passages seem to me to point indubitably to *facis incendium* in our verse, in which the context clearly demands a reference to the fire of Love.

Of course, editors have been slow to adopt Lambinus' suggestion, not only because they question the authenticity of the MSS evidence, but also because the verse involves us in metrical difficulties. I cannot hope to convince all students of Plautus that the last three syllables of *incendium* may be treated as a dactylic foot in this verse; perhaps some will object to the complete absorption of (*t*)*uom* in the first syllable of *incendes*; so only will Lambinus' verse scan. But I may remind the incredulous that the dactyl in question stands in the fifth foot of a trochaic septenarius, and that Seyffert and Skutsch (*Γέρας*, p. 137, n. 4) in spite of Leo (*Pl. Forsch.* pp. 242 ff.) are willing to admit the following trochaic septenarii in Plautus:

ei mihi, ei mihi istaec illum pérđidit assentatio: *Bacch.* 411.

nunquam erit tam avarus quin te gratiā emittat manu: *Capt.* 408.

qui sacerdotem violare | audeat sed eae mulieres: *Rud.* 646.

These to be sure are cretic words in the fifth foot treated as dactyls. Must *incendium* be excluded from this category? The incredulous may prefer to reverse the order, reading *incendium facis* with the final syllable of *facis* short, an easier manifestation of iambic shortening. All that I care to contend is that Plautus used *facere incendium*, not *facere indicium* in this verse.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## BOOK REVIEWS

---

*A History of Classical Scholarship.* Vol. II, "From the Revival of Learning to the End of the Eighteenth Century," pp. xxviii + 498; Vol. III, "The Eighteenth Century in Germany and the Nineteenth Century in Europe," pp. xii + 523. By JOHN EDWIN SANDYS, LITT. D., Fellow of St. John's College, and Public Orator in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press, 1908. Each volume \$1.95.

It will be recalled that the first volume of this important work appeared in a second edition in 1906, and carried the record of classical learning down to the year 1300. These later volumes fulfil the author's hope, expressed six years ago, of continuing the story from the time of Petrarch to the present day. Dr. Sandys' Harvard Lectures on the Revival of Learning were in the nature of preliminary essays in the field now treated in the second volume, which ends with the discussion of scholarship in the Netherlands in the eighteenth century. The third volume continues with the account of Germany's work in the same century, and, passing on and through the nineteenth, concludes with the year 1908. The chapters of the two volumes are numbered continuously, but there are separate indices for each.

The reader who studies attentively the enormous mass of biographical detail of which the work is largely composed is impressed by the author's sureness in facts and dates; by his exactness in reference and quotation; by the scrupulous weighing of terms and thoroughness in handling the bibliographical material; by his cosmopolitan reach and courteous fairness to all the nationalities that fall within his scope. Those who approve the strictly biographical method adopted by Dr. Sandys can have little fault to find with what he offers, unless it be on the score of occasional inequality in the allotment of space to certain names and topics. Thus the discovery and early history of the Marmor Parium are treated under the name of Selden; but this method leaves unnoticed Wendelin's astronomical work in connection therewith, although Wendelin's contemporary, Andreas Schott, and his publication of the Monumentum Ancyranum find due record. Nor do we find the later fortunes of the Parian Marble with the newer fragments discovered in 1897 and published in the *Corpus* by Hiller von Gaertringen, recorded in their proper place in the third volume. Erycius Puteanus, the pupil and successor of Lipsius at Louvain, has a deservedly small paragraph; his

more vigorous but jealous colleague, Castellanus, perhaps as deservedly, has none. Everything that experience in making books can suggest has been employed to make this work easy of reference. There are excellent summaries—which might have been multiplied to advantage—useful tables, e. g., of the editiones principes of Greek and Latin authors, and elaborate tables of chronology and of bibliography. The illustrations, gathered with characteristic industry, from multifarious sources, are in general well executed, most of them presenting interesting portraits. Few errors occur in the excellently printed work. The Dutch name of Woverius (or Woverius), it may be noted, was apparently Jan van den Wouwere, not van der Wouwer.

But though the biographical method has the advantage of including in their proper place many interesting and instructive personal details, these are sometimes so disconnected that one is apt to miss the perspective. We should have liked to have a clearer account of the tendencies of thought that marked each important epoch; a larger view of what the study of Greek and Latin has meant to different generations; the relation of that study to the civilization of each age, whereby the modern classical student, for example, by apprehending better the lessons that Greek life and letters have had to offer at different times, might have deduced a stronger argument for the cause of Greek at the present time than this book can afford.

Moreover, a separate survey of the progress of learning in the several departments of classical philology and archaeology would have been welcome. These fields are, of course, touched on in connection with the lives of men who were prominent in them; but a retrospect of the study of epigraphy, for example, or of rhetoric—not noticed as a special tendency in the Netherlands at the beginning of the seventeenth century—or of archaeology in general, would have been helpful. Here and there we get incidentally sections on the rise of the English colleges, on the pronunciation of Greek, on the founding of the national academies, and the like. By means of the index a student may piece together an account of the study of Homer or of Lucretius; but it will be piecemeal. Nevertheless, it is ungenerous to carp at these generous volumes, with their wealth of material soundly presented, affording the reader safe means for making his own generalizations.

CHARLES BURTON GULICK

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

---

*Syntax des Nominativs und Accusativs im Lateinischen.* By  
C. F. W. MÜLLER. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1908.  
175 pp.

The veteran Ciceronian critic had undertaken the preparation of the "Kasuslehre" for the *Historische Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*

now in course of publication under the editorial supervision of Landgraf, and early in 1903 had already sent to the printer the portion of the work covering the nominative, vocative, and accusative cases. His death followed soon after, before he had begun the correction of the proofs, and the volume, issued as a Supplement to the *Historische Grammatik*, was put through the press by his colleague Skutsch, assisted by Witte und Kroll.<sup>1</sup>

Three pages are devoted to the nominative and vocative; the remainder of the book deals with the accusative, and is an exhaustive presentation of the history of that case from the beginnings of the literature down to the latest grammarians and Church Fathers. The first and fullest chapter treats of the "Accusativ des Inhalts," covering not only the commoner manifestations of that use, but in great detail the instances of the cognate accusative and of neuter pronouns and adjectives. Subsequent topics are the "Accusative of Extent," "Greek Accusative" (distinguished naturally from the use with passives used as middles), the various types of the "Accusativ des Effekts," the "Double Accusative," "Accusative with Compounded Intransitives," "Accusatives with Substantives," and the various idiomatic uses, such as *magnam partem, id genus*, etc. I have noted no discussion of the "Accusative of Limit of Motion."

Though a very full repository of pertinent illustrations classified with great accuracy, the work is much more than that. The virtually complete material which Müller's industry had accumulated enables him to discuss many problems with a more adequate basis for judgment than was possible for any previous writer on the subject. Kritz and Kraner, for example, had maintained that *multum* in its abverbial use denoted only "Maas" or "Grad." Dietsch on Sallust *Jugurtha* i. 5, suggests "in adverbio multum inest aut rei saepius factae aut modi maioris, interdum ambae vix distinguui possunt." What had been an inadequately supported impression on Dietsch's part, becomes in the light of Müller's copious illustrations an established fact. Only the context can determine whether *multum* in a given case means "often" or "to a high degree." Often, too, we receive from Müller important corrections of the statements of earlier scholars as to the frequency or range of a construction. Thus Wölfflin *Comparation*, p. 29, tells us that, apart from Plaut. *Aul.* 420, *plus miser*, the comparative of adjectives formed with *plus* does not occur before Tertullian. But Müller cites some fifteen instances of the formation from Ennius, Horace, Livy, Ovid, Gellius, Quintilian, and other writers. Hand, iv, p. 474, had said: "pauca sunt verba, veluti diligendi, credendi, nocendi, quae cum adverbio *plurimum* componi solent," and cited but four verbs with which *plurimum* occurred. Müller's material shows conclusively that Hand was ignorant both of the

<sup>1</sup> Müller had also begun work upon the dative, but had not proceeded far when death overtook him. The few pages of his manuscript treating of this case have recently been published in *Glotta*, II, pp. 169 ff.

frequency of the use and its range. It is found with no fewer than sixteen different verbs of a considerable variety of meanings in Cicero alone, to say nothing of its far from infrequent use in Sallust, Caesar, Livy, and other writers.

In dealing with textual problems Müller naturally exhibits the same conservatism as characterizes his own textual labors, and is inclined to support MS tradition as against the acceptance of conjectures. Thus in Caesar *B. G.* ii. 35, he holds to *xv dies supplicatio decreta est* (where editors write *in dies* or *dierum*), citing in support Cato *Agr.* 112. 2, *in sole ponito biduum*; 162. 3, *suspendito in vento biduum*; as well as Livy xxvii. 4. 15, *supplicatio diem indicta*, where again *in* has been gratuitously inserted by editors.

Despite the wealth of material presented in Müller's volume, there are topics where fuller illustration is desirable. One misses citations of passages showing two accusatives with *transduco*, particularly as bearing on the text in Caesar *B. G.* ii. 10. 1, *funditores pontem traducit*, where Meusel, followed by many recent editors, reads *ponte*. Similarly under *celo*, and particularly in the case of verbs of making, calling, regarding, and the like with two accusatives. But omissions of this sort are rare and relatively trivial. The value and importance of the work will be at once apparent to all who desire to learn the ultimate facts of usage from an authoritative source, and will assure its title to be regarded, as Skutsch in his Preface himself denominates it, "ein dauernder Besitz unserer Wissenschaft."

CHARLES E. BENNETT

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

---

C. Suetoni Tranquilli opera. Vol. I: De vita Caesarum libri viii. Recensuit MAXIMILIANUS IHM. Editio minor. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Pp. 359. M. 2.40.

The first volume of Ihm's new recension of Suetonius, which was published by Teubner in 1907, is now added to the "Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana," with such omissions as the scope of this series rendered necessary. The text is naturally the same as that of the *editio maior*, and the critical apparatus, which in accordance with the usage in the more recent volumes of this series is at the foot of the page, although considerably reduced, contains all of the most important variant readings. The *testimonia*, however, are omitted, as well as the illustrations. The Preface gives the history of the text and the relations of the MSS, together with the lists of editions and special works dealing with the author, but considerations of space have compelled the omission of the valuable list of *mendorum genera*, which is found in the larger edition.

Considering that fifty years have elapsed since the appearance of Roth's edition, the number of variations from his text which have resulted from Ihm's long and careful study of Suetonius is surprisingly small. These are in general in the direction of a return to the manuscript readings, even when these are manifestly corrupt, as well as unintelligible. The function of a critical text should be to give us the text of a writer according to the best evidence, but everyone will await with interest Ihm's commentary, in which the interpretation of moot points will be discussed.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

*Untersuchungen zu Lucilius.* Von CONRAD CICHORIUS. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1908. Pp. 364. M. 12.

This study of Lucilius from the point of view of a professor of history is an interesting and important addition to the recent edition of Marx. The author speaks in the highest terms of Marx's commentary, although he differs from his conclusions in not a few particulars. The uncertainty which must always attend the reconstruction of a writer whose works are preserved only in the form of citations is vividly shown by a comparison of the interpretation of certain passages by L. Müller, Marx, and Cichorius. The brilliant and ingenious combinations from which information as to the details of the life of Lucilius is derived by all these scholars more frequently arouse our admiration than convince us.

Cichorius rightly emphasizes the value of Lucilius as an historical source, since he furnishes the only contemporary document, with the exception of a few fragments of the orators, for the period from the middle of the Numantine war until near the close of the struggle with the Cimbri and Teutones, and we cannot but wish that the interpretation of the fragments were less doubtful.

In the chapter on the life of Lucilius the stemma of the poet's family is reconstructed from his father M. Lucilius to Pompey the Great, but unfortunately it all rests on the unproven assumption that the Manius Lucilius of the *Senatus consultum* of Adramyttium (*Ephem. Epigr.* IV. 213) is the poet's brother. Both Marx and Cichorius agree that Lucilius never married, basing this opinion on the uncomplimentary reference to women in the fragments and the indications of various liaisons; but one cannot but think of the case of Euripides. As to the date of Lucilius' birth, Cichorius rejects the ingenious theory of Haupt, which has been accepted by Marx and others, and with considerable probability assigns it to 167, assuming a transposition of X and L in Hieronymus. Cichorius also disagrees with Marx in regarding Lucilius as a Roman citizen and a member of the equestrian order. Both agree in making him the posses-

sor of estates in Sicily, but on evidence which is not very convincing. Perhaps the least successful effort of Cichorius is his attempt to show that Lucilius made a journey to Greece and there met Clitomachus, who dedicated a book to him.

But it would be unfair merely to speak of the weak points of this exceedingly careful and detailed study of Lucilius and his works, which discusses independently and with due consideration of all the available material the life of the poet, the chronology of his works as a whole and in detail, and the interpretation of many passages. Its results will always have to be taken into account in any work on Lucilius.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

*P. Papini Stati operum.* Vol. II, fasc. ii: P. Papini Stati *Thebais*. Edidit ALFREDUS KLOTZ. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908. Pp. 583. M. 8.

The edition of the *Thebais* of Statius, which follows that of the *Silvae* and *Achilleis* by the same author, is based on a new examination of a large number of codices. These are reduced by the editor to two classes, one of which consists of Parisinus 8051 with its corrections by three hands, while the second comprises some twenty others. The critical apparatus is much fuller than is usual in the volumes of this series, and since the *testimonia* are given as well, we have in this edition a standard critical text of the *Thebais*. The Preface contains, besides other matter, a list of editions and of articles dealing with the text, and there is an *Index nominum* in which fuller citations are given than in that of Bährrens. An Appendix contains the arguments to the various books, which Klotz discussed in the *Archiv. f. lat. Lex. u. Gram.* XV (1907), pp. 261-74, and regarded as written in Gaul between the fourth and the sixth centuries.

JOHN C. ROLFE

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

*Hellenistische Wundererzählungen.* Von R. REITZENSTEIN. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.

The intricate and acute investigation which is presented in this work, has as its ultimate goal the explanation of the literary form of such narratives of miracles and wonders as are found best exemplified in the *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*. Its starting-point was an effort to explain the two supposedly gnostic hymns in the *Acta Thorneae*, a study which led to the conclusion that not only the hymns themselves, but also the wonder-tales in which they are incorporated, are derived from Hellenistic sources. The Hellenistic literature which thus forms the background

and prototype of the works in question is designated as *ἀπεραλογία* and its authors were called *ἀπεραλόγοι*. The explanation of these terms, their development and application, forms the first part of Reitzenstein's volume; the second part is devoted to the *Acta Thorneae* and to a demonstration of the *provenance* of its form in accordance with the results obtained in Part I. The treatment stops short of as full a discussion of the canonical Acts as the reader's curiosity craves, but certainly one cannot complain of a paucity of documents considered. Yet with all recognition of the intricacy of the problem and of the service to scholarship which Reitzenstein has performed, it must be said that the learned and distinguished author has failed to present his results in a reasonably clear and comprehensible form. The book is (so far as the main argument goes) desperately hard reading, and the fault is not wholly due to the character of the problem involved. One discovers that there is material here for surprise and fascination, but emotion fades before a baffling obscurity of treatment. The work is rich in suggestive details which touch a much wider range of literature than is revealed by the title, or than can be indicated by a notice so brief as this must necessarily be. The reader will find in the course of Reitzenstein's argument stimulating and fruitful discussions of the theory of ancient historiography, of Roman satire in relation to Greek prototypes, of elegy and biography, not to mention a large number of detailed observations which shed much light upon particular works and passages.

G. L. HENDRICKSON

---

*Vorträge und Aufsätze.* Von HERRMANN USENER. Leipzig:  
Teubner, 1907.

In the year 1888, at an age (fifty-four) when most scholars have already either done their best work, or at least have clearly outlined the character and direction of the subsequent work that may be expected from them, Usener began that great series of studies in the history of religion and mythology which have done most to give his name a peculiar eminence in the scholarship of our time. In that year the first of the *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (the memorable *Weihnachtsfest*) appeared; memorable certainly to the writer of these lines, then a student at Bonn and a witness of the sensation which the book caused in the vivid intellectual life of the university. It had had forerunners, to be sure, in some lesser publications of earlier date, as, for example, the *Legenden der Pelagia* which forms one of the most interesting studies of the present volume. From this time on, with the exception of the edition of the rhetorical works of Dionysius, Usener's studies and publications were devoted almost exclusively to religious origins and mythology, until for some years before his death (in 1905) he had come to be

looked upon as the founder of a largely conceived *Religionswissenschaft*. The programme of this conception is outlined with splendid enthusiasm and grasp in the essay entitled *Mythologie* (of the year 1904), which is probably the most important of the papers making up this volume. In general it is to be said that those studies which touch upon the central intents of his later years seem the most vital and significant. Two of the longest, *Philologie und Geschichtswissenschaft* (1882) and *Organisation der wissenschaftlichen Arbeit* (1884), attracted much attention at the time of their appearance, but they have not the present vitality of the religious and mythological themes. In the early eighties, when the academic lecture course on "Encyclopädie und Methodologie" was still in full vigor, the effort to define classical philology and to differentiate it from historical science was a livelier topic than it is today. Usener's treatment of the problem and his solution of it was once revealed gospel for his pupils, and certainly no one can now read it without much clarification of thought. But time and resignation in the undefinable have robbed it of something of its pristine brilliancy.

Taken all in all the *Vorträge und Aufsätze* form a volume of remarkable interest, which must prove fruitful and stimulating not only through its positive content, but also for the example of method and presentation which it affords. Those who knew Usener as a man between fifty and sixty years of age will find the portrait, which forms the frontispiece, at once characteristic and disappointing. One may conjecture that the affliction of partial blindness caused a contraction of eyes and brow in his later years, which at least in the representation here given has robbed his face of that largeness and nobility of expression, combined with a flashing eye, which no one of his pupils can forget.

G. L. HENDRICKSON

---

*The Deification of Abstract Ideas in Roman Literature and Inscriptions.* By HAROLD L. AXTELL. Chicago dissertation. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907. Pp. 100. 75 cents.

This study is divided into two parts. In the first Dr. Axtell considers the deified abstracts as individual cults under the following heads: (1) state-cults, (2) abstracts popularly but not officially worshiped, (3) occasional and individual deifications, and (4) doubtful examples; in the second part he deals with the deified abstracts as a class, and treats them as to (1) their origin, (2) their mention in literature, and (3) their appearance in inscriptions.

The most important part of this dissertation is the discussion (pp. 59-67) of the origin of abstract deifications, in which the author takes reasonable issue with certain current notions. On the question of origin

scholars are divided into two parties: one, to which Mommsen and Boissier belonged, maintains that the conception of abstract divinities belonged to the oldest stages of Roman religious thought; the other, of which Wissowa is today the most eminent representative, holds that the early Romans did not deify either the powers of nature or ethical concepts, but rather that the abstract divinities arose fairly late, and that they owed their being to the detachment of epithets from a few chief gods, as, for example, Victoria, who is thought to have sprung from a Jupiter Victor, Fides from Jupiter Fidius, etc. Between these two views Axtell wisely takes a middle position. He points out on the one hand that the early Romans of the agricultural stage had already deified certain *res expetendae*, such as Ops—"the abundance of grain"—and probably Bonus Eventus. This view is supported by the practice of other Italian peoples, for the Sabines worshiped Salus, at the Umbrian town of Oriculum there was a cult of Valentia, and the Latins themselves worshiped Fors Fortuna. On the other hand, Axtell grants that certain abstract deities were probably derived from epithets. e. g., Iuventas and Libertas; but the derivation of Fides from an epithet of Jupiter he is inclined to doubt, objecting that the theory of such origin depends wholly on the fact that the three chief *flamines* took part annually in her worship and on the proximity of her temple to that of Jupiter; but these he does not regard as cogent reasons for the view of Wissowa and his school. His protest against the excessive use of similarity in dates of festivals and of temple foundations to establish relationships between divinities is also timely and well made.

The rest of the dissertation is not so important. The list of abstract divinities in the first part is useful, but adds little or nothing to the knowledge we already possessed. One point, however, deserves favorable mention. By a clever combination of Ovid *Ex Ponto* iii. 6. 23-26 with a notice in the *Fasti Capitolini* Axtell fixes with great probability the date of the dedication of the temple as well as the statue of Iustitia as January 8, 13 A. D. But the greater part of the author's remarks on the several divinities are only repetitions of material found elsewhere. We must regret that he did not give more attention to Deubner's article on personifications in *Roscher's Lexikon* and to certain other studies. Furthermore, in dealing with the testimony of Latin literature it would have been well to abandon the chronological order for one based on relative importance; and finally, although the writer avowedly omitted coins from his sources, it must be recognized that no study of this subject can be satisfactory which disregards them. Yet, after all these reservations have been made, the dissertation remains a creditable piece of work.

CLIFFORD HERSCHEL MOORE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

*Notes on Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb.* By BASIL L. GILDERSLEEVE. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1909. Pp. 64. \$0.50.

Professor Gildersleeve's three papers reviewing Professor J. M. Stahl's *Kritisch-Historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums* (1907) have been reprinted from the *Journal of Philology* in a booklet of sixty-four pages, and are well worthy of this separate issue. The opening sentence gives a good reason for the undertaking of this laborious task: "No one can appreciate the value of Stahl's *Syntax of the Greek Verb* so well as one who has worked on the same lines for as many years as Stahl has done and on the same general principle of direct study of the monuments of the language." Readers of the *Journal of Philology* are well aware of the wide range of Professor Gildersleeve's syntactical studies and interests, but the numerous references here made to *A. J. P.*, as well as to *S. C. G. (Syntax of Classical Greek)*, bring all into review again and make one realize afresh the extent of the author's work in this field.

"My time is short," says Professor Gildersleeve at the outset, "and the best I can do under the circumstances is to summarize the book, so far as that is possible in the compass of two or three articles." We do get a summary, but much more. We have running comments that combine charm with illumination. Indeed, many will feel about it as Professor Goodwin did when he said, "His two reviews of Weber's work on the final sentence, in Vols. III and IV of his *Journal*, may well save many scholars the trouble of reading the book itself, while they contain much new matter that is valuable to everyone." His comments are everywhere distinctive and striking. For an example, take this sentence: "Unfortunately the sphygmograph is itself a throbbing finger, and the observer is apt to confound the beat of his own heart with the pulse of that very tricky personification, language." After eighteen pages of illuminating *prolegomena*, the author announces that the real business will begin with the Tenses and Moods. Five pages on Stahl's presentation of the Voices then conclude chap. i. The second paper, of twenty pages, is devoted to Stahl's treatment of the Tenses, the third, of twenty-one pages, to the Moods. A notice like this is not the place to summarize what itself purports to be but a summary, though it is so much more. The author is doubtless weary of applause. But I wish he might really know with what pleasure and pride we welcome such work as this from a man who the other day celebrated his seventy-eighth birthday; who, fourteen years after the age of retirement set by the Carnegie Institution, discharges the full duties of his professorship, and edits the *Journal* with all the vigor of youth. He puts us younger workers to shame.

C. F. S.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

*Mathematik und Philosophie bei Plato.* Von DR. RUDOLF EBELING. *Jahresbericht des Gymnasiums zu Hann. Münden.* Mündener Tageblatt-Druckerei, 1909. Pp. 28.

This treatise, as its title implies, adds nothing to our knowledge of the history of mathematics and makes no attempt to solve the specific mathematical puzzles of the *Meno*, the *Republic*, and the *Timaeus*, but it is a useful résumé and discussion of all Plato's allusions to the subject. Assuming the dates of the dialogues as given in Raeder or the fifth edition of Christ, it endeavors to trace the evolution of Plato's thought in relation to mathematics. After the *Republic* a period of skepticism is assumed whose first literary document is the *Theaetetus*. Plato criticizes his own former views and attempts an empirical reconstruction of philosophy. The old antithesis and dualism of opinion and knowledge, however, still persist in the *Philebus*, and cannot, Ebeling frankly admits, be sophisticated away. It is also, he admits, explicitly affirmed in the *Timaeus*. If it disappears in the *Laws*, we cannot know whether Plato had changed his mind or despaired of a solution. Ebeling, then, after all is unable to construct a continuous evolution for Plato's thought. He finds it rather a curve with two highest points, one in the middle, the other at the end. The *Epinomis* he accepts as genuine, as he does the *Letters*, including the second! It is the end and the summit of Platonic philosophy, the union of science and religion.

In my *Unity of Plato's Thought* I endeavored to show, not that Plato never changed his mind or mood, but that sound interpretation of the dialogues affords no basis for current hypotheses of a fundamental reconstruction of his philosophy in or soon after the *Republic*. I have since illustrated this in the case of Gomperz's otherwise admirable *History of Greek Philosophy* (see *Classical Philology*, Vol. I, p. 295). Space fails to follow Ebeling's arguments in detail; I can only record my doubt or dissent in a few typical instances. Quite fanciful is the suggestion that the respectful (!) treatment of Hippias in the two dialogues that bear his name is probably due to the fact that Plato drew his mathematical inspiration from the Sophist.

*Unity*, nn. 191, 192. The alleged contradiction between the *Theætetetus* and the *Republic* about  $\mu\bar{\eta}$   $\bar{\nu}$  is explained away, *ibid.*, pp. 53 ff. The reference to *Republic* 475 for a contradiction of the statement in *Theætetetus* 155 E that  $\pi\bar{r}\acute{a}\bar{c}\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$  and  $\gamma\bar{e}\bar{v}\acute{e}\bar{r}\acute{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$  are  $\bar{o}\bar{v}\bar{r}\bar{a}$  is quite irrelevant. In the *Theætetetus*  $\pi\bar{r}\acute{a}\bar{c}\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$  and  $\gamma\bar{e}\bar{v}\acute{e}\bar{r}\acute{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$  are abstractions which nominalists and crass materialists refuse to recognize at all. The *Republic* passage merely satirizes lovers of sights and sounds who are devoted to particular concrete  $\pi\bar{r}\acute{a}\bar{c}\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$  and  $\gamma\bar{e}\bar{v}\acute{e}\bar{r}\acute{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$  (the words do not occur) namely, theatrical exhibitions, etc. The irrelevance of the comparison appears at once if we cite four words of the *Theætetetus* context,  $\pi\bar{r}\acute{a}\bar{c}\bar{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$   $\delta\bar{e}$   $\kappa\bar{a}\bar{l}$   $\gamma\bar{e}\bar{v}\acute{e}\bar{r}\acute{e}\bar{s}\bar{u}\bar{s}$   $\kappa\bar{a}\bar{l}$   $\pi\bar{a}\bar{v}\bar{u}\bar{s}$   $\tau\bar{o}$   $\bar{d}\bar{o}\bar{p}\bar{a}\bar{r}\bar{o}\bar{v}$ . Cf. *Cratyl.* 386 E.

PAUL SHOREY

*The General Civil and Military Administration of Noricum and Raetia*. By MARY BRADFORD PEAKS. Reprint from the University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. IV, pp. 161-230. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907.

In the preface of the *Roman Provinces* Mommsen remarks that a correct view of the Imperial period cannot be obtained if the histories of the several provinces be left out of consideration. This is the typical attitude of latter-day historical criticism. We have come to realize that, for our world, Roman history was as truly in the making in the provincial *concilia* and the outlying garrison-towns as in the Curia and the barracks of the praetorians. The present monograph is a well-planned addition to the increasing series of special studies of Roman provinces which the exactions of the modern spirit have suggested.

Miss Peaks discusses first in a general way the officials who figured in the administration of the provinces, their ranks, titles, and functions. The Fasti of the provinces follow. Each name, after Liebenam's method, is accompanied by the literary and the epigraphical data by which its position is fixed. Numerous additions, of course, have been made to the antiquated lists compiled over twenty years ago by Liebenam in *Die Laufbahn der Procuratoren*, Jena, 1886, and *Die Legaten in den römischen Provinzen*, Leipzig, 1888. Material furnished by the supplementary volumes of *CIL* III and an occasional grain of data gleaned from recent periodical literature have enabled the author to insert several names not catalogued in the *Prosopographia*. Cf. p. 175, No. 15; p. 185, No. 3; p. 189, No. 15, etc. Sabinus, assigned by Liebenam and the *Prosopographia* to Noricum will be found among the legates of Raetia.

Part II, "The Army," catalogues the legionary and the auxiliary forces stationed in Noricum and Raetia—which were, for minor provinces,

strongly garrisoned—and also the contingents of native troops which were furnished for service elsewhere. A muster-roll of the second and third *Legiones Italicae* has likewise been compiled. This section of the paper is a useful supplement to the studies of the military of neighboring provinces made by Mlle. Vaschide in her *Histoire de la conquête romaine de la Dacie*, Paris, 1903, and by Filow *Die Legionen der Provinz Moesia*, Leipzig, 1906 = *Clio*, Beiheft VI.

The paper as a whole makes its strongest appeal as a careful synthesis of data hitherto dispersed in divers places and as a supplement, brought conscientiously up to date, to previous work on the two provinces. This is not to say that Miss Peaks has given us merely a "useful compilation." In more than one instance she has modified prevailing views although these contributions are mostly relegated to the footnotes. The array of evidence marshaled in support of the contention that the term *regnum* as applied to Noricum was a popular survival of former usage and carried with it no especial political significance, is convincing. Cf. p. 165, n. 9. Liebenam dismissed the question with "Der Name wechselte." Miss Peaks rightly calls attention to the extension in meaning which attached itself to the word *consularis*. Cf. p. 200, n. 11. The development from the literal technical sense to the later ornamental application of the term may be traced also in Syrian inscriptions. Cf. Wadd., No. 2212.

It is to be hoped that Miss Peaks will redeem her promise to write a formal history of Noricum and Raetia. The accuracy, the mastery of method, and the grasp on the literature displayed in these preliminary chapters give earnest of a work that, within the more restricted limits imposed by the subject, will do for Noricum and Raetia what Victor Chapot has done for Asia.

DUANE REED STUART

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

---

*Phoinix von Kolophon.* Texte und Untersuchungen von DR.

GUSTAV ADOLF GERHARD. Leipzig und Berlin: B. G.

Teubner, 1909. Pp. vii + 302.

By his patience and skill the editor has succeeded in patching together fragments of papyri now described as Papyrus Heid. 310. To these he has brought into close relation the London Papyrus 155 *verso*; an older version of the latter he has discovered in an Oxford fragment (Bodl. MS. gr. class. f, Ip). The result is four Hellenistic "Iaμβοι, in fragmentary form, three of which are expositions in verse of popular philosophy, largely Cynic in tone, one directed against *αἰσχροκέρδεια* in serious manner, another more lightly handled on the unwise use of wealth, a third an example of the antipederastic preachments of the Cynics. The second is

scribed in the papyrus to Phoenix, the other two are anonymous. The fourth, contained in the English documents, is anonymous, and on the same theme as the first. The editor's work consists of a report of his combination and collation of the fragments, an elaborate commentary on the four texts, three essays—on Phoenix, on choliambic poetry, on gnomic poetry in the Hellenistic period—and indices of words, facts, proper names, and passages; a photographic reproduction of the Heidelberg papyrus is prefixed to the book.

Aside from the ingenuity shown in patching together the fragments, the notable feature of the book is the intelligent industry revealed in the rich commentary provided for the four poems. Geffcken, in his edition of Leonidas of Tarentum, has indicated the influence of Cynic philosophy upon the epigram; Norden and others have discovered points of contact with Roman satire; but Gerhard, in his elaborate notes to these choliambic poems, has thrown a great deal of light upon mime, comedy, satire, and epigram. The relation of Cynic philosophy to all these types urgently demands treatment in special essays. Meantime students of the drama, satire, and epigram cannot afford to neglect the rich supply of material scattered through Gerhard's notes. The general chapters that conclude the book show a similar diligence, and familiarity with the highways and byways of the literature.

HENRY W. PRESCOTT

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

---

*Thukydides für den Schulgebrauch.* Erklärt von G. BOEHME  
von der vierten Auflage an bearbeitet von S. WIDMANN.  
Buch VI. Sechste, gänzlich umgearbeitete Auflage. Leipzig:  
B. G. Teubner, 1906.

Boehme's edition of Thucydides edited with a commentary for the use of students in secondary schools appeared in 1856, and in the course of twenty years reached the fourth edition. In 1882 Widmann undertook a modified revision for the fifth edition. Sixth editions of Books i, ii, and vi have since appeared. The notes, which are printed at the foot of the page, are much fuller than in the earlier editions. Boehme had laid the chief emphasis on "grammatisch-rhetorische" notes. In order to make the separate volumes more useful Widmann has incorporated in the commentary much material that had appeared in the historical and geographical indices of the complete edition. In fact this is an entirely new edition. The grammatical commentary is much fuller. In the matter of interpretation, text, history, and geography the recent literature is always cited. Aid in the way of translation is given sparingly.

R. J. BONNER

*The "Rhetoric" of Aristotle.* A Translation by SIR RICHARD CLAVERHOUSE JEBB, edited with an Introduction and with Supplementary Notes by JOHN EDWIN SANDYS. Cambridge: University Press, 1909. Pp. xxviii + 207. \$1.44.

Professor Jebb's many sided scholarship led him into every possible field of Greek literature. He knew his Aristotle as he knew his Sophocles. He began his translation of the *Rhetoric*, we are told, in 1872, completed it in 1873; he also made this work of the great Stagirite the subject of his university lectures in 1872-73 and again in 1873-74, and during those years his elaborate notes were worked up. But, though the full translation was then all written out ready for the press, it remained unpublished at the time of his death. The work of editing and publishing the manuscript was entrusted to Professor Sandys—very appropriately, both because of his personal relations to Jebb and because of his thorough preparation for the task through his having brought out some years before Cope's monumental edition and commentaries.

The introduction, by Sandys, is a brief historical sketch of Greek rhetoric from Homer to Aristotle, with a critique of Aristotle's work.

Jebb's translation has been carefully revised, with slight omissions filled in by Sandys. Occasionally an omission has escaped even his eagle eye, e. g., I. ix. 36; x. 18; xi. 11.

For its convenient use with almost any edition, the common references to the chapters and sections of the Oxford Variorum edition of 1820 and to the pages of Bekker's Berlin edition of 1831 are given at the top of each page.

The translation is felicitous and clear, of course; nothing less could have been expected from such a translator; it is usually literal, always idiomatic; Aristotle's longer periods are broken up into sharp, concise sentences; technical words are rendered with corresponding technical terms with that astounding skill that was Jebb's. But occasionally it is so free as to be rather interpretation than translation: e. g., *νῦν μὲν οὖν οἱ τὰς τέχνας τῶν λόγων συντίθεντες διλύγον πεπορίκασσιν αἰτήσις μόριον*—"Now hitherto the writers of treatises on rhetoric have constructed only a small part of that art." We wonder, too, that in spite of Jebb's painstaking attention to details, the lights and shadows cast by little particles are often neglected; the ellipsis of *καὶ γάρ* he consistently declines to fill in, and *γάρ* he often ignores (e. g., p. 21).

The book reads, for the most part, like an original composition in English. Sometimes the foreign idiom obtrudes itself: e. g., "things, which are not to be, cannot be about to be done" (I. iii. 8). The only real defect is a frequent tendency to independent participial clauses: e. g., "The elements of wealth are—plenty of money . . . the possession of furniture, of cattle, and of slaves . . . ; it being understood that these

are safe . . . and useful" (a co-ordinate sentence in the Greek, I. v. 7); ". . . when 'friend' has been defined; your friend being a person who tends to do for your sake those things which he thinks good for you" (to translate a *ὅτι* clause, I. v. 16); "These ascertained, their opposites are manifest; blame being derived from the opposite things" (to translate a *γάρ* clause, I. ix. 41).

A different choice of possible renderings, here and there, might have appealed to some readers as better than those which the translator adopted; but they could mostly be reduced to differences of opinion or taste in matters of interpretation. *φιλακή*, however, as the *τέλος* of *τυραννίς* (I. viii. 5) is surely not "police", but "self-preservation" or "self-maintenance."

This posthumous volume of our great English scholar will take its proper place in the splendid array of masterly translations of the Greek classics that he has left us.

WALTER MILLER

TULANE UNIVERSITY

*The Seven Against Thebes of Aeschylus.* With Introduction, Critical Notes, Commentary, Translation, and a Recension of the Medicean Scholia. By T. G. TUCKER, LITT.D. Cambridge: The University Press, 1908. Pp. xi + 255.

We have in this edition a "conscientious interpretation of the Septem as a work of dramatic art and a monument of Greek literature." In the forceful translation, commentary, and critical notes, one finds constant illumination. The editor has apparently "read with alertness all Greek writing of repute." And I note with interest and satisfaction that there are upwards of fifty parallels from modern authors. In 52 five parallels are cited, besides 717, where two more appear. Nine parallel passages are cited to illustrate the asyndeton in 60.

In matters of textual criticism, Professor Tucker has hardly been as conservative as the statement in his preface would lead us to expect. Nevertheless, his emendations are for the most part supported by sound argument; all are possible; but some to say the least are improbable. It is by no means a difficult task for an ingenious critic to propose several conjectures for a corrupt passage, all of which will appear plausible. Two doubtful emendations that we hesitate to accept have already been pointed out by Dr. Verrall in the *Classical Review* (XXII. 247)—*παρ'*, *εἰκε* (692) and *σωτηρίᾳ* (812). Of the others, some of which are convincing, I cite the following:

*έκάστος'* (13), *θεοφάτοις* (27), *φρένας πεδί'* *όπλοκτυφ'*, *ώς* (83), addition of *δε τοί* (115), of *βαλών* (123), *μέν* (128), *δέ* (129), *ἐκπυκάζου* (134), *δδ'* *ἐτερόφρονι* (155), *δείξατε* (160), *τι κύματι* (193), *μηγάδα* (225), *κακκενουμένα* (317), *πρόλιφ'*

(332), *σεσημάτισται* (452), *κλύω τῶν* (553), *δῆ* (554), *όμμα* (564), *τελείφ* (751), *ἀρτίφρων ὁν* (763), *τάδε* (836), *τάδε* (886), *ὅπον σφι* (994), *φῶ* (1048).

The notes are full and instructive. Sometimes space might have been saved by excision or cross-reference. Cf. 6 with 476. Vs. 12 is rightly taken to refer to *τὸν ἐλλείποντα* and *τὸν ἔκηβον*, and 17-20 correctly translated "she with her open inn, the kindly soil, bore all the moil of nurture, and bred you to found homes, bearing the shield and keeping the faith, that you might accrue to meet the present claim." Those who have visited Thebes will readily agree with Professor Tucker that it is unnecessary to follow the scholiast in his interpretation of 79—*θαρράζονται ταῦτα*. The combination *τίς ἄρα* (91) does not always "express anxiety." Cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 816. In 93, *πότερα* is the reading of M, which seems to me to be preferable to the emendation *πότ' ἄρα*. Vs. 99 is correctly explained "be concerned with." In 107 *δονλογίνας ὑπὲρ* seems to me to stand for simple *περὶ δονλείας*. Cf. Lys. 12. 73 (*περὶ*) with 2. 41 (*ὑπὲρ δονλείας κιδηνεύειν*), and the passage cited by the editor from Demosthenes (*Ol.* 1. 5) *οὐ περὶ δόξης οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ μέρους χώρας πολεμοῦσιν*. When one fights, it is a question of life and death, or of liberty and slavery, and the thing which makes him fight (one and the same from different points of view, or at least blended into one as the moving cause) is expressed by *περὶ* or *ὑπὲρ* and the genitive; *περὶ ἐλευθερίας* (because he wants it), *περὶ δονλείας* (because he does not want it). So with praying. It is *δονλεία* that makes the troop of maidens a *ικέσιον λόχον*. In good prose *θελούσας* (449) cannot be said to be represented by *χρηζούσας*, which does not occur at all in Lysias, Isocrates, Antiphon, Lycurgus, Aeschines, Dinarchus, or Demosthenes, and only once even in Thucydides. The conjecture *πεπέμψθω* (for *πέπεμπτ'* *οὐ* of M, *πέμπεται* rec.) in 460 seems to me improbable from the sense alone, to say nothing of the fact that the perfect imperative passive is not a common form in poetry, nor in prose, for that matter, except in Plato, and even here only in the *Laws* and *Republic* to any extent. Not till we come to later Greek do we find the form in abundance. There are about five hundred examples in the whole literature, but I have not as yet found a single *πεπέμψθω*. This would not, of course, preclude the possibility of its employment here. 610 *ποδῶκες ὄμμα* is explained as = "an eye to which the foot answers swiftly." 858, a long note on *μή* and *μὴ οὐ* with the infinitive, without a hint as to the difference of feeling, though it is true that "*μὴ οὐ* is the more regular idiom after the negative, but the simple *μή* is very frequent."

The edition is remarkably free from typographical errors, but I note that in vs. 861 *ἀτρίμονες* has lost its accent. The editor does not seem to have touched on the question whether the last scene in our version is a later addition.

To conclude, Professor Tucker has given us an excellent edition of a

play which, as the edition points out, has lost "much of its tragic force" (as all Greek tragedies must, in varying degrees, for the modern world), yet a play in which we can still feel the "Aeschylean power of language with its extraordinary specific gravity, its magnificent compression, and its brilliant figurativeness, by means of which the poet brings into the modest compass of a little over a thousand lines enough matter to have furnished forth as many more in many another writer."

J. E. HARRY

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

---

*Greek Architecture.* By ALLAN MARQUAND, PH.D., L.H.D.  
New York: Macmillan, 1909. Pp. 425. \$2.25 net.

A full and trustworthy account in English of Greek architecture has been greatly needed, most published treatises on the subject having been neither full nor trustworthy and none, so far as I know, having been both. Professor Marquand's volume, which appears in the series of "Handbooks of Archaeology and Antiquities," edited by Professors Percy Gardner and F. W. Kelsey, represents a conscientious and largely successful attempt to achieve both fulness and trustworthiness.

The plan of the book is not historical, but topical. The six chapters deal with "Materials and Construction," "Architectural Forms," "Proportion," "Decoration," "Composition and Style," "Monuments." Under these heads are set down, side by side, facts relating not only to the various periods of Greek architecture, as that term is commonly understood, but also to the profoundly different prehistoric architecture of Cnossus, Phaestus, Tiryns, and Mycenae and occasionally to the distinctively Roman developments of Greek architecture. There is nowhere a chronological table, and although the terms "Mycenaean," "archaic," "classical," and "Hellenistic" occur, these terms are nowhere defined. This almost complete effacement of the historical point of view appears to me a grave defect.

Of the 392 excellent illustrations only one, the 392<sup>1</sup>, shows a Greek columnar building as a whole. This is Mr. W. B. Dinsmoor's restoration of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus. The nearest thing to a complete view of a typical Greek temple, the supreme creation of Greek architecture, is Fig. 335, showing the ruined east end of the Parthenon. The whole book is concerned with details and we hardly see the wood for the trees. It will be impossible for a beginner to build up out of these scattered statements and illustrations mental pictures of Greek architecture in the large at any stage of its development. The book will have to be used as a supplement to elementary treatises of more conventional plan. It is a storehouse of detailed information and a guide to the copious literature of the subject. Indeed it goes beyond the limits of Greek architecture

considered as a fine art, touching not only upon concrete floors and library shelves, but even upon such remoter matters as moats, street pavements, and ships.

As I have intimated above, this mass of information, dealing with facts far more variable than the casual student dreams, has been conscientiously compiled. As a matter of course, some mistakes have crept in. Thus, the statement (pp. 241, 242) that "Doric simae of the archaic and classic periods were decorated with painted [uncarved] ornament" does not hold true of the Argive Heraeum and the Temple of Athena Alea at Tegea, which Professor Marquand would probably not exclude from the classic period; and it is not true as stated on p. 256, that in the Parthenon the construction of the corner intercolumniations extends to the intercolumniations next to the last. But I will not attempt a list of particulars. Let me only say that I think the Greek terms sprinkled freely through the book need considerable revision. When some competent scholar publishes a glossary of Greek architectural terms, it will be easier to be accurate in this matter.

F. B. TARBELL

---

*Index to the Fragments of the Greek Elegiac and Iambic Poets.*

By MARY CORWIN LANE, A.B. *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology*, No. XVIII. Ithaca: Longmans, Green & Co., 1908. Pp. 128.

Miss Lane's *Index* will be serviceable and we should therefore thank her for it without inquiring too curiously into the logical justification of the inclusion in one list of such disparates as Archilochus, Solon, Aristotle's *Paean*, parts of Xenophanes, and the epigrams attributed to Plato. The Teubner *Anthologia* is not a scientific unit, but a convenience. But it is in many hands and this *Index* will facilitate its use. The work, to judge by sampling, has been carefully done.

PAUL SHOREY

---

*The Roman Forum, its History and its Monuments.* By CHR. HUELSEN. Translated by JESSE BENEDICT CARTER. Second edition revised and enlarged. Rome: Loescher & Co.; New York: G. E. Stechert & Co., 1909. Pp. xv+271. \$1.75.

The second edition (1905) of the original work of Professor Huelsen's, and its English translation by Professor Carter (1906), were reviewed in a previous issue of this Journal (1906, pp. 427, 428). As very little work has been done in the Forum during the past three years, almost no new discoveries need to be chronicled, and the book is therefore only slightly enlarged. The number of illustrations has been increased from 139 to

151, a few verbal changes have been made, and the *Tribunal Praetorium* is described at length (pp. 149-51). The references to the literature of the Forum have also been brought down to date. Professor Huelsen has not changed his views on any of the disputed points in the archaeology of the Forum, but in general he avoids all controversial matter.

To the unqualified commendation that has already been bestowed upon this book nothing need be added here. It is difficult to see how it could be improved—except by more careful proofreading.

S. B. P.

---

*C. Plini Caecili Secundi epistularum libri novem, epistularum ad Traianum liber, panegyricus.* Recensuit R. C. KUKULA. Leipzig: Teubner, 1908.

Müller's text of Pliny's *Letters and Panegyric* is now followed within a lustrum by another in the same series from the hand of Professor Kukula, of the University of Graz, whose work in this field has been known to scholars through a few articles in the *Wiener Studien* and the *Serta Harteliana*, and an annotated edition of selections from the Letters issued in the Teubner series of *Meisterwerke* in 1904. The edition is very welcome, and the material furnished in the *adnotatio critica* at the foot of the pages, though it does not give a complete statement of MS readings, will be found very useful by students of the text.

It is likely to appear strange to American classical scholars that their European colleagues, who have no thousand leagues of dissevering sea between them and the great repositories of MSS, should so frequently be content with no personal search for, and study of, the MSS on which their work finally depends. Doubtless the mere collation of MSS appears an elementary task. It is certainly a wearisome and time-consuming task. But it has been too often left to tyros, and their errors and inefficiencies have tainted the critical work of greater men than themselves, and have infected from the source the whole stream of critical treatment. It might certainly appear unnecessary to affirm that the most fundamental thing of all is to know what the MSS say, and that only after this is determined can we properly proceed to classification, and the inferences that rest upon classification. But the truism evidently needs, like the Ten Commandments said to have been discovered by Mr. Roosevelt, continued and emphasized repetition. Only repeated reviews of others' collations, plus independent extension of effort in the same field, can assure us the proper basis for a critical superstructure. There will still be room enough for conjectural emendation after all this dull work is done. There will also doubtless be room for the coruscations of those who cannot distinguish between what the author probably

did say and what he might have said, or might better have said, or what they imagine they would have said, if they had been in his place.

It is to be regretted in some measure that Professor Kukula is so vague in his statement in the Preface about the degree of his own responsibility for the report of the selected MS readings that he gives. Professor Stangl has furnished him with collations of RFM; but of his own work he says uncertainly, "Cum superiore anno in Italia commoratus aliquot codices rursum contulisset *uel saltem* eiusmodi locis inspexisset, quibus de Keili aliorumque censura dubitabam" (italics by the present writer). The critical reader would like to know definitely—perhaps may be said to have a right to know—to just what readings the editor is producing the testimony of his own eyes, and in just what he is merely reproducing Keil, or somebody else unspecified, because he has himself had no doubt, for one reason or another, that Keil, or the other *quicunque*, was right. We mention this point because of its importance in the entire field of such publication.

Professor Kukula has studiously considered and weighed the published work of all former critics. He agrees with Otto that Keil was wrong in attributing undoubted pre-eminence to MV as truthful representatives of the archetype; but he does believe that MV very frequently (*plerumque*) have preserved the true order of words, while RF more accurately record the words themselves. So in the constitution of his text he attempts to steer a sort of middle course between the claims of these two families. But the principle might cause some perturbation of critical soul. For suppose we grant, as Professor Kukula, following Otto, believes, that the tradition of MV clearly shows the work of some "doctus emendator." Such a considerable revision, made at the time when this revision appears to have been made (though neither Otto nor Kukula suggests a date), must have been made, like other similar revisions, in the interest of a revised scholastic rhetoric. It certainly, therefore, would not confine itself wholly, or even chiefly, to the substitution of one word for another. Sequences of words, clausulae, and the like, would be the points to which its activity would be largely directed. To hold, therefore, that the MV tradition was scholastically revised, as Professor Kukula does hold, and at the same time to hold, as he also does, that in its word-sequence it should be preferred to the RF tradition, which shows no signs of such formal revision, is unreasonable. The word-order of MV must surely have suffered more from the postulated sophistication than has that of RF from the gradual accumulation of sporadic glosses and from accidental misplacements in transcription. Just as the hedgebound school-ma'am prunes the independent tendencies of her pupils' minds and pens into spiritless conformity with the commonplace, so the scholastic reviser worked in that arid bloom of the fifth and sixth centuries. The formally correct, rule-perfect, some-

what jejune order of MV, where it differs from that of RF, is without doubt in large measure the visible result of the postulated scholastic revision. The reviser tried to reduce what appeared to him irregularities, or eccentricities, into conformity with the rules of the school. That is just what the school-ma'am is forever trying to do. It is the point in which the modern critic's mind works like that of his scholastic predecessor.

There seems, therefore, to be a rather shaky foundation for Professor Kukula's *uia media*. Yet of course no reasonable critic would affirm that in every point of similar sort where MV differ from RF, the former are wrong and the latter right. There is at least some sense in the almost rabid pronouncements of a recent English editor of Juvenal *in usum editorum*.

In the lack of personal study of the MSS Professor Kukula has in certain points reproduced Keil to the detriment of his own work. Keil, for example, made no investigation of the class of eight-book MSS, though he rightly determined its existence as a class. But he found it easier to cite the readily accessible D (a patently corrupt text), and certain early printed editions, which were for the most part reproductions, more or less accurate, of the eight-book tradition. Thus he gave an unscientific trend to Plinian criticism which has infected later work. What earthly reason could there be, for example, for citing *in extenso* the *editio princeps*, unless it could be shown that the editor of the *princeps* had access to, and reproduced, a MS or MSS, of undoubted excellence, and of a tradition at present unknown? (Sabbadini's conclusions, on pp. 113, and elsewhere, in his *La scuola e gli studi di Guarino Guarini Veronese*, might easily lead to false inferences about the present state of the eight-book MSS, as Sabbadini has been in some respects misled by Keil.) The same thing might be said of the Roman edition of Schurener (1474?), except in regard to the eighth book, where it is interesting for its mysterious resurrection of a considerable part of that book, which all the known MSS of the eight-book class lack entirely. The same thing might almost be said of Keil's exaltation of the editions of Pomponius Laetus, Beroaldus, and Catanaeus to such a degree of prominence. Professor Kukula would have done better to leave the following of Keil in these respects, and to substitute for the copying of early editions the copying of the better MSS of the class on which the early editors for the most part depended. Their better readings might well be cited, of course, where they differ from the readings of MSS of the eight-book class now known, though in these instances it is generally impossible to say that they did not depend upon conjectural emendation merely. They certainly did so in more instances than Keil was willing to admit.

In the book of correspondence with Trajan there is no sign that the editor has taken pains to correct the faulty collations of Avantius and Aldus made by Keil, and he has been misled by Hardy in the matter of the report of the Bodleian text, as has, indeed, everybody else up to a recent time (see *Class. Phil.* II, pp. 129-156). The work on the *Panegyric* is naturally of less importance than it would have been before the edition of Baehrens appeared, but it seems to be faithfully and well done, except for the lack of personal study of the MSS.

In the matter of the settlement of questions of text where conjectural emendation must find place, Professor Kukula has been reasonably conservative and self-restrained. As every wise man often enough has reason to do, he has retracted some of his earlier suggestions, and has given others a modest *malum* in the notes instead of putting them into the text. But for the discussion of these individual points, tempting as some of them are, space does not suffice.

While expressing thus much of dissent from the principles and the practice of the editor, we would not fail to recognize that he has given us a good text, and one especially well equipped within its limits for the use of advanced students.

E. T. M.

*Philologie et linguistique. Mélanges offerts à LOUIS HAVET par ses anciens élèves et ses amis à l'occasion du 60<sup>e</sup> anniversaire de sa naissance, le 6 Janvier 1909.* Paris: Hachette, 1909. Pp. 624.

The thirty-seven contributors to this complimentary volume are apparently all of the nationality of their friend and teacher, and number among them some of the best-known French classical scholars, and others whose present work augurs fair fame in the future. The subjects treated are more generally in the Latin than in the Greek field, and are well distributed among phonetic, grammatical, and literary themes. Several show pleasing indications of the progress of manuscript studies in France, though none are directly concerned with pure paleographical science, in which Frenchmen ought to excel. Why should not Paris develop a school of paleography to vie with that of Munich, which has been so untimely robbed of its head? The article by R. Cagnat on "La réorganisation de l'Afrique sous Dioclétien" stands on an almost isolated eminence among its companions, not merely because of its quality and the ripe knowledge of its author in the field essayed, but also as being on a historical subject. A good classified index makes the volume easy of consultation on individual points.

E. T. M.

*Hellas and Hesperia or The Vitality of Greek Studies in America.* Three Lectures. By BASIL LANNEAU GILDER-SLEEVE. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1909. Pp. 130.

These lectures do not present themselves at the bar of a "journal devoted to research," and Professor Gildersleeve cries *ἀλοντες ἐπίβα κόπος* and is unwilling to have his nothings monstered. But we may be permitted to congratulate the audiences that first enjoyed all this witty wisdom and to recommend its enjoyment in book form to all who accept the Horatian *ridentem dicere verum*. The excellent portrait that fronts the title-page enhances the value of the volume to the author's many friends, pupils, and admirers, among whom we wish to be counted.

THE EDITORS

